United Nations S/PV.6300

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6300th meeting

Thursday, 22 April 2010, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Takasu	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Barbalic
	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	China	Mr. Li Baodong
	France	Mr. Araud
	Gabon	Mr. Issoze-Ngondet
	Lebanon	Ms. Ziade
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Apakan
	Uganda	Mr. Rugunda
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff

Agenda

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507)

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/165)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-32351 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507)

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/165)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Germany, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Malta, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, Ukraine, Uruguay and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2010/165, containing a letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept paper for this debate.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers, Council and non-Council members, to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously and to allow the many delegations to speak within the allocated time. Delegations with lengthy statements are requested to deliver a condensed version and to circulate the full text.

I shall now give the floor to the Council members.

Mr. Apakan (Turkey): I would first like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on the Security Council's working methods. This is an issue of great importance to the entire United Nations membership, and regular exchanges in such settings are extremely helpful in understanding and addressing mutual concerns and expectations.

Indeed, the Security Council is the principal organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and, as such, not only what it does, but also how it does it are matters of legitimate interest to the entire international community. In that regard, although there is broad recognition of the seriousness and productivity of the Council, criticism of its working methods and, in particular, of the way in which it interacts with the outside world is abundant.

The debate on the matter revolves mainly around a number of shortcomings that are seen to undermine the work of the Council. Indeed, there have been repeated arguments about the deficit of democracy, legitimacy, legality, accountability and representativeness in the Council. I am not arguing about whether these are right or wrong, but I believe that we need to be aware of these perceptions if we are to address them properly. After all, legitimacy and credibility are products of performance and develop in line with the fulfilment of expectations.

Of course, given the special nature of the Security Council, one has to be aware of the inherent limitations of what can be achieved through an exercise focused only on working methods in the absence of a wider reform initiative. In fact, all principal organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, must go through a reform process to ensure the coherence and integrity of the Organization.

However, this does not mean that improvements in working methods are either impossible or ineffective without reforming the Council. On the contrary, many

of these negative perceptions have been somewhat alleviated by small but effective measures taken over the years regarding the Council's working methods. The presidential note in document S/2006/507, prepared under Japan's presidency in 2006, is an excellent example of what could be done through such initiatives. Furthermore, it would be artificial and distorting to see the Council through the lens of permanent-versus-elected members, as they all bear collective responsibility for international peace and security. The Council belongs to us all — not only to the 15 but to the entire United Nations membership. Hence, there is a collective responsibility to make it work better.

Therefore, it would be wiser for us today to approach this issue in a practical rather than a philosophical manner. We need to be realistic and to focus on what is feasible as opposed to what is ideal. We must act with common sense and with a view to finding the right balance between effectiveness, transparency and credibility. In this regard, the full and effective implementation of the agreed measures in S/2006/507 and subsequent notes is certainly what is needed most. Of course, we should also continue trying to further improve and expand on document S/2006/507 in light of the evolving practices of the Council and the specific needs of international relations, and taking into account the views of non-members. The ongoing process in the Working Group on Procedures presents an important opportunity in this direction, and we very much welcome Japan's leadership in this regard. Given the excellent working relationship currently prevailing in the Council, I have full confidence that a satisfactory outcome will be achieved to that process.

The Council's working methods, I believe, can be taken up in two distinct but related categories. One is related to the Council's internal working culture and the other pertains to its relationship with interlocutors outside the Council. Today, in view of the time constraints and public nature of this debate, I will focus on the latter aspect and try to offer some practical ideas and suggestions, many of which are in fact already cited in document S/2006/507.

The primary aim in addressing the Council's relations with non-members should be to increase the transparency of its work, to make it more interactive with partners, and to ensure that it is better informed on issues it is dealing with. Any success in this direction will make the Council more effective and its decisions more implementable. To that end, we should first continue trying to have more open formal meetings as opposed to closed consultations. The statistics show that this is indeed possible without having any negative effect on the work of the Council. On the contrary, it makes the Council more accessible and credible.

We should also try to have a closer working relationship with the troop- and police-contributing countries, especially with respect to the missions in which they participate. There are many ways of doing this, but more frequent and substantive meetings with them come at the top of the list. We are already making some strides in this direction in the context of the peacekeeping reform we embarked upon last year, but there is room for more progress. In this regard, we can also consider sharing the reports and draft resolutions concerning their missions with the troop-contributing countries, simultaneously with the Council members, and seek their views and inputs in a timely manner.

Likewise, organizing informal, interactive dialogue meetings with countries that the Council deals with as part of its agenda can also be a step in the right direction. Those "15+n" meetings will give us the opportunity to listen to their side of the story and receive first-hand information as to the situation on the ground. Such exchanges need not always be at the ambassadorial level, and we can consider also holding them among the experts or coordinators.

Another valuable idea that I understand is repeated almost every time we have this discussion is the utility of having regular meetings with the Presidents of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission. In addition to the Presidents of the Council meeting with them every month, which has been partly implemented, we might also consider inviting them to our working luncheons with the Secretary-General.

Of course, I would be remiss if I did not mention the need for and benefit of regular consultations with regional and subregional organizations, such as the African Union, which can complement the work of the Council and create a synergy of efforts. Given the overlapping agendas and common objectives, that point needs no further explanation but full implementation. The same is valid for the Arria Formula meetings, whereby we have the opportunity to listen to non-member stakeholders and representatives of

non-governmental organizations, who often provide clear, uncensored and eye-opening assessments of the questions we grapple with in the Council. The informal character of these meetings is in itself an advantage that needs to be tapped more often.

In the same vein, the Security Council's missions could and should be used more effectively in communicating our messages, contacting our interlocutors on the ground and getting a better first-hand assessment of the situation. The terms of reference and objectives of these missions should thus be prepared very carefully so as to better serve our larger purposes.

Finally, the Presidents of the Council should be given a more systematic role in conveying the gist of our closed consultations to non-members and the media. The practice of issuing oral remarks after consultations is thus very useful, but we should avoid micromanaging the exercise and allow more leeway to the Presidents in informing the interested parties about the Council's deliberations.

Before concluding, I would like to touch very briefly upon another issue that is somewhat pertinent to our internal working culture, but is also of critical importance to the legitimacy and credibility of the Council's decisions. It concerns how we prepare and negotiate the Council's documents, be they resolutions or press and presidential statements. Indeed, the tendency in the Council is to hold advance consultations on many of those documents among a limited number of countries, such as groups of friends, before sharing them with the rest of the Council members.

One might argue in favour of the practical utility of having directly interested countries agree on the basic parameters of documents in a way that facilitates consensus-building. However, that should by no means limit the full involvement of all Council members in the work of the Council. Otherwise, the ownership and thus the implementability of the Council's decisions would be weakened. Moreover, the fact that the Council often acts as a quasi-judicial body whose decisions, such as sanctions, affect international law as well, involving every member fully in decision-shaping and decision-making processes, is of even further significance in that respect.

I have spoken at length. I know that there are many more speakers on the list, so let me stop here and congratulate you once again, Sir, not only for this particular meeting, but for Japan's continued leadership in improving the working methods of the Council. I am confident that today's meeting and our efforts within the Council will empower the Council and make it a more effective, transparent and coherent body — a goal commonly shared by the United Nations membership.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The drafting by Security Council members in 2006 of recommendations on the Council's working methods, which were incorporated into the relevant note of the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507), was very significant for strengthening the principles of transparency and effectiveness in the work of the Security Council.

In recent years, Security Council members have made significant progress in these areas through constructive dialogue with interested Member States that are non-members of the Council. The number of open meetings of the Council has increased. The Council President has adopted the systematic practice of holding briefings for Member States, including on the Council's programme of work.

The subsidiary bodies of the Council present regular reports on their work. The quality of the Council's annual reports has improved. Comprehensive and regularly updated information on the work of the Council is posted on its website. Items on the Security Council's agenda are added and removed in an orderly manner. Opportunities for contact between the Security Council and interested States have increased, including as part of the Arria Formula meetings and the so-called informal interactive dialogues.

The Security Council is actively cooperating with countries contributing troops and police to United Nations peacekeeping operations through the Peacebuilding Commission and its country configurations. An additional impulse was given to dialogue with regional organizations with a view to fully harnessing the potential of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. This is by no means a full list of the real achievements in improving the working methods of the Security Council.

We believe that Member States will take reciprocal steps and demonstrate even greater interest in cooperating with the Security Council. In practice, despite the increased number of open meetings of the Council and briefings by the President of the Security

Council, low Member attendance persists. It is important for countries that contribute troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations to participate more actively in the discussions at their regular meetings with the Council and to offer specific assessments and opinions for Council members could use in their work. In other words, we must note that, to date, opportunities that are currently available have not been fully exploited by non-members.

Article 30 of the Charter defines the prerogative of the Security Council to establish its own rules of procedure. In implementation of that role, it is striving methodically in its Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions to improve its working methods. Russia notes the professional leadership of the Group by its current Chair, the Permanent Representative of Japan, Mr. Takasu.

Academic and unrealistic approaches in this area could have a negative impact on the productivity of the Security Council's work. It is important to maintain a balance between openness in the work of the Security Council, on the one hand, and ensuring the effectiveness, functionality and appropriate confidentiality of its work, on the other. Security Council members are prepared to further heed the good advice on improving its working methods. We trust that today's meeting will facilitate the gathering of more information on the opinions and preferences of non-members of the Council. However, decisions in this area will be taken only by members of the Council in the context of their Charter-mandated responsibilities.

Mr. Puente (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank you, Sir, for convening this open debate on the implementation of the measures set out in the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507 on the working methods of the Security Council. My delegation recognizes the efforts made by Japan as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions to continue to improve the transparency and efficiency of the Council's work and its interaction with the wider United Nations membership.

We feel that the Security Council's reflections on its working methods are part of a more wide-ranging exercise of interest to United Nations Members regarding comprehensive reform of the Council. As an urgent matter, such reform must be adapted to the new global balances and challenges. As an elected member of the Security Council, Mexico shares these objectives. Our actions in the Security Council have been and will continue to be guided by the principles of transparency, democratization and accountability.

Today's debate is particularly important in pursuing the discussion that began in 2006 with the adoption of presidential note S/2006/507, which has led to significant improvements in the Council's working methods. Nonetheless, although much remains to be done, it is essential that the Informal Working Group on Documentation continue to discuss and analyse in-depth the implementation of the recommendations in document S/2006/507, and define the updating necessary to continuing to improve the Council's working methods. Mexico hopes that this will lead to the adoption in the coming months of a comprehensive presidential note. To achieve that goal and to continue to strengthen the Council's transparency, the participation of all States Members of the Organization in this discussion is necessary.

Since the adoption of presidential note S/2006/507, the Council has held a greater number of open meetings and open debates, not only on matters relating to the Council's agenda, but also on cross-cutting themes that impact on peacekeeping and international security. Similarly, since 2008 it has improved the content of its annual report to the General Assembly in response to a long-standing demand by the membership. There is also greater interaction between police- and troop-contributing countries and the Council.

Despite these improvements, not all of the recommendations in document S/2006/507 have been implemented and new concerns have arisen that must be taken into account by the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

On transparency, my delegation considers it necessary to continue to increase the number of open meetings of the Council and to ensure that informal consultations are convened only when strictly necessary, thus promoting greater interaction among Council members. It is important to question the relevance of holding informal consultations to hear statements and briefings that could be given in open meetings, although they provide additional information for the Council's internal work. It is also necessary to

continue to enhance the internal transparency of the Council. At present, most decisions are taken by consensus, which ensures greater political impact for Security Council decisions. Such unity will be preserved only if we maintain internal transparency.

Regarding effectiveness, the Council must continue to explore and, if possible, codify the various meeting formats that allow it to address all threats to international peace and security and to interact with all States and actors involved in a conflict, including civil society. Recent informal interactive dialogues on Chad and Sri Lanka, as well as the increased number of Arria Formula meetings, are successful demonstrations of the Council's new flexibility in executing its responsibilities.

On the issue of inclusiveness, the practice whereby new Presidents of the Security Council submit the monthly agenda to Member States and the media must be perpetuated. However, this practice should be expanded and systematized in order to strengthen the consistency of discussions with the Organization's wider membership. An additional resource that has proved useful in that area is the regular informational briefings of Security Council members by the respective regional groups. As an elected member of the Security Council, my delegation has participated actively in these informational meetings with the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

I conclude by referring to a matter of great importance. As stated in Article 24 of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council acts on behalf of Member States in maintaining international peace and security. To protect this essential principle, the Security Council must continue to fine-tune its working methods in order to ensure that its decisions are effectively implemented by all Member States, as provided by Article 25 of the Charter, and ultimately to enhance its credibility.

Mr. Li Baodong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate. I also take this opportunity to thank the Member States for their care and support for the work of the Security Council.

The Charter of the United Nations entrusts the Security Council with the solemn responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. In today's complex state of international affairs, fraught with security challenges of all kinds and with expectations high on the part of the Member States, the Security Council finds itself facing colossal tasks.

In recent years, the Council has striven to meet its responsibilities and made active efforts to improve its working methods and enhance the transparency of its work. The Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions has carried out fruitful work, and the President's note contained in document S/2006/507 marks an important step towards further improvement of the rules and procedures of the Security Council. Efforts in this regard have also benefited from constructive views and proposals put forward by Member States. We should build on the results achieved so far, base our actions on reality, and continue to tap potentials for the improvement of the Council's working methods so as to make its work more equitable, efficient and transparent.

I believe that we should focus our efforts on the following aspects. First, we should widely seek the views of non-members of the Council and strengthen communication and interaction with them. Useful practices in this regard include monthly briefings by the presidency of the Security Council to non-members of the Council and dialogues with troop-contributing countries (TCCs). We hope that the Council fully hears the views and proposals of the Member States. We also hope that the latter will make the best use of such occasions as open meetings and meetings with TCCs to air their views so that the Council can be informed of their valuable opinions.

Secondly, we should seek practical results in the enhancement of transparency. Efforts to enhance transparency should stress the participation of Member States and the practical results achieved, instead of becoming a matter of formality. Open meetings are more transparent and enjoy the broader participation of Member States. As such, they offer an important platform for non-members of the Council to participate in the work of the Council. We hope that open meetings will be more results-oriented so that non-members of the Council are given an opportunity to present their views and proposals. The themes of open meetings should have a more narrow focus and should not be too general.

Thirdly, we should focus our energy on addressing major and urgent threats to international peace and security. We support the annual review by the Informal Working Group on Documentation and

Other Procedural Questions of items on the Security Council's agenda in order to keep the agenda current, save resources and increase efficiency. Recent years have seen an excessive increase in thematic items, some of which are beyond the Council's sphere of competence. This trend should be a matter of concern to Member States.

Fourthly, we should further improve the timeliness and quality of Council documents. The surge in quantity of documents adopted by the Security Council in recent years demonstrates the increase in the Council's workload, but also serves as a reminder that greater attention should be paid to the quality of documents and their practical implementation. Reports of the Secretary-General should strive to be more targeted and timely so as to become living documents that genuinely reflect problems and present recommendations. Due attention should be given to making relevant documents available in all six official languages in a timely manner, which is an important step in enhancing the transparency and openness of the Security Council.

Improving the working methods of the Security Council is a long-term task that cannot be accomplished all at once. We are willing to work with others in making unremitting efforts in this regard. We are convinced that, with the continuous improvement of its working methods and incessant innovation of its practice, the Security Council will be better able to fulfil the mission entrusted to it by the States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (Austria): I would first like to thank the Japanese presidency for convening today's open debate. We are grateful to Japan for its chairmanship of the Informal Working Group of the Council on this topic. We also wish to say a special word of thanks to the group of five small States for their important contributions to the subject we are discussing today.

We believe that any effort to improve the working methods of the Council must focus on two goals: enhancing transparency and strengthening interaction between the Council and the United Nations membership at large. The Council must also aim at maximum transparency vis-à-vis the broader public, in particular through its cooperation with the media.

In recent years, we have seen some improvement in the realization of these aims. The Council has increased the number of its open debates and briefings. The consultation process which the Council has established with the troop- and police-contributing countries before deciding on the mandate of a mission or its renewal is another step in the right direction. In some instances, so-called informal interactive dialogues have provided the Security Council and interested countries with a useful framework for a direct informal exchange on issues of concern to the Council. This is a path that we should explore further.

I should also like to commend the initiative of Uganda to organize an informal meeting with Member States on the occasion of the presentation of the most recent annual report of the Council to the General Assembly. We hope that this practice will be continued.

At the same time, there are other areas in which we still see substantial potential for improving the Council's working methods. One example is the cooperation between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). It has been our experience that chairpersons of country-specific configurations of the PBC contribute in a very useful manner to the public meetings of the Council on the country situations they deal with. At the same time, it has also been very helpful to listen to their additional comments during subsequent Council consultations, but so far, that has of course been possible only when the chairperson in question also happens to represent a Council member. We believe that it would be beneficial for the Council to have the chairs of all country-specific configurations of the PBC — I repeat, all country-specific configurations of the PBC — participate in the relevant consultations of the Council independently of whether they represent Council members or not.

One important way to improve interaction between the Council and whole groups of the membership is an intensified cooperation with regional and subregional organizations. The Security Council debated this subject under the presidency of China (see S/PV.6257) and agreed that an increasing interaction of this kind contributes to the coherent and effective implementation of the Council's resolutions. That is certainly true for cooperation between the Council and the European Union, which has a strong interest in contributing to the work of the Council in many areas of mutual concern, and even more so since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty.

Austria has made a special effort to contribute towards increased transparency and interaction in the subsidiary Council bodies that it has honour to chair. In the Informal Working Group on International Tribunals, Austria is maintaining close dialogue with the specially affected countries and the host countries of the Tribunals. We also organized an Arria Formula meeting on residual issues of the Tribunals, open to all United Nations Member States. We introduced regular biannual briefings, we issued an annual summary of the activities of the Group and, for the first time ever, a chapter on the Working Group was included in the latest annual report of the Security Council (A/64/2).

Furthermore, I would like to highlight some developments in the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, which Austria also chairs. Resolution 1904 (2009) of December 2009 substantially improves the procedures under the 1267 sanctions regime in terms of due process. For the first time ever, individuals and entities seeking de-listing will have the chance to present their cases to an independent and impartial ombudsperson to be appointed by the Secretary-General. It also directs the ombudsperson to forward to petitioners all information about the negative decision provided by the Committee, including explanatory comments. Security Council resolution 1904 (2009) represents a significant step forward in improving the fairness and transparency of the 1267 sanctions regime, thus enhancing both its effectiveness and its legitimacy. This is an area which has been discussed quite often in recent debates on today's subject. Still, much depends on the practical implementation of that resolution, especially on the appointment of an eminent ombudsperson in the near future.

Adding to something my Turkish colleague said, let me say that transparency and interaction are constant challenges in the relations not only between the Council and the wider membership but at times also within the Council itself. With regard to some issues on the agenda of the Council, its decisions are prepared within various special formats. We are well aware of the political and practical reasons for which these formats have developed, but experience also shows how important inclusiveness and transparency can be for achieving and preserving the unity of the Council.

The Council's working methods have developed over the years, yet they will remain a work in progress. As the work of the Security Council adapts to changed circumstances, so should the Council's working methods. Involvement of the wider membership will remain key in order to serve the interests of the entire world Organization.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): Thank you, Mr. President, for convening this debate today. Japan has made an important contribution over recent years to the development of Security Council working methods, including through your leadership on the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507, which has helpfully codified and clarified our working practices. Our guiding principle should be effectiveness, and I would like to highlight seven points, picking up the themes of your concept paper for this debate (S/2010/165).

First, we welcome the positive trends identified in your paper towards greater transparency of Council working methods. A particular responsibility falls on the presidency each month to keep other Member States informed of the Council's work. We have made such briefings a priority during our recent presidencies and encourage others to make this a consistent practice.

Second, we need to make sure that the current arrangements for meetings of the Council in these new temporary premises do not impede interaction between Council members and other Member States.

Third, we need to balance transparency with effectiveness. The Security Council needs to be able to discuss some sensitive matters out of the public eye. But when we do meet in private the onus is on us as Council members to make sure that we have a genuinely interactive discussion. On occasion, our private consultations differ little from formal meetings in the Chamber. I hope that we can make a collective effort to make the informal consultations a forum for real debate. The Secretariat should help by keeping its briefings short and operationally focused.

Fourth, broadening the range of views available to the Security Council can often help its effectiveness. The United Kingdom and France have led efforts to improve the Council's dialogue with troop- and police-contributing countries. Under our presidency in August last year, the Council adopted a presidential statement (S/PRST/2009/24) which reaffirmed the Council's intention to further strengthen its cooperation with

those countries and the need to build on this progress. We commend the current presidency for providing summaries of troop-contributing country meetings at the start of Council discussions. But it is not just the troop-contributing countries. As the Permanent Representative of Austria has said, we should also seek more focused advice from the Peacebuilding Commission as we discuss peacekeeping mandates.

Fifth, we welcome the recent innovation of informal interactive dialogues, which has widened the scope for interaction with non-members. This has enabled the Council to discuss sensitive issues in a flexible format, and we encourage further use of such informal formats for Council meetings.

Sixth, Security Council missions can be an effective tool for the Council to understand and influence high-priority issues. We now need to consider how to maximize their operational effectiveness. The Council must be clear from the outset on its objectives and must design the format of the mission accordingly, including, where appropriate, by sending missions composed of a limited number of Council members.

Seventh, the Council should pay greater attention to conflict prevention. There should be a greater openness to discussions in the Council on situations of emerging conflict, so that we can determine an effective preventive response. We would like to see more frequent briefings by the Secretariat, on an ad hoc basis, on situations of emerging concern. The Secretary-General and his senior officials should be invited to brief the Security Council as a matter of routine when they return from visits to countries on the Council's agenda or other countries of concern. We would also support regular briefings from the Secretary-General's Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities.

In conclusion, note S/2006/507 covers a lot of ground, and today the Council will hear many proposals for how it might be improved. It is right that the Council's procedures as a whole should be reviewed, but we would encourage you, Mr. President, to identify for agreement by the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions a short list of priority areas for implementation, which it would be the responsibility of future presidencies to take forward. We look forward to participating actively in that ongoing debate.

experiences and to listen to their presentations, as was the case during the presidency of China early this year when we discussed the theme of cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations in maintaining international peace and security (see S/PV.6257).

Lebanon also calls for increased interaction between the Security Council and the heads of other United Nations bodies, such as the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and Peacebuilding Commission. In addition, Lebanon believes that States involved in conflicts under consideration by the Council should attend closed consultations, because it is essential to hear their views by virtue of their direct involvement with said conflicts.

On the other hand, Lebanon welcomes the coordinating meetings that take place between the Council and troop-contributing countries and calls for their expansion to include host States as well. Lebanon also supports the idea of hearing briefings by the Secretary-General's representatives in open plenary meeting and not in closed, except in exceptional circumstances.

As for the Security Council's subsidiary organs, notwithstanding the steps proposed in the President's Note contained in document S/2006/507, they remain insufficient. Lebanon therefore proposes that the agendas of the Security Council's subsidiary organs be published and circulated prior to their meetings, including on the website of each body, in order to inform States of their work. We also call for increasing the number of meetings between the heads of the subsidiary organs, especially the Sanctions Committees, and non-members of the Security Council to inform them on a regular basis of the details of the meetings held and resolutions adopted, as this would increase transparency and dialogue.

Lebanon joins in the numerous appeals for the definitive adoption of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council after more than 60 years of considering them to be provisional. We also stress the need to involve all Council members in preparing draft resolutions and presidential statements.

When we speak of effectiveness, we have to consider the Security Council resolutions that have not yet been implemented and to find a mechanism to secure their implementation. I will offer the Arab-Israeli conflict as an example because it is the oldest item on the agenda of the Security Council. Dozens of resolutions have been adopted in this respect, but the occupation continues and the settlements are unchanged. That is why we must stop the rhetoric and move towards implementation.

In conclusion, Lebanon calls for convening an open meeting at least once a year to consider the working methods of the Security Council, which are not a goal in themselves but a means towards further transparency, effectiveness and interaction. Lebanon is aware that agreeing the most suitable rules for the working methods of the Council is related not only to the proposed ideas, but also to the political will of States.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): Thank you, Mr. President, for initiating this very important meeting and for providing a valuable concept paper to facilitate our discussions this morning.

The working methods of any organization constitute a very critical ingredient of its performance and overall success. We therefore welcome this debate as a practical step to reinforce not only the efficiency and transparency of the Council, but also its interaction and dialogue with non-members of the Council.

I would like to elaborate on three elements that are crucial to the improvement of the Security Council's working methods. The first element is transparency. We believe that transparency in the work of the Council will not only promote accountability, but will also earn the Council the confidence of the broader United Nations membership and the global public. In accordance with Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, more formal meetings, such as today's debate, and access to information will allow for the proper evaluation of the effectiveness and inadequacies of the Council.

The monthly briefing to non-members of the Council on the programme of work, the monthly assessment of the Council's presidency, and greater coverage of the activities of the various subsidiary bodies of the Council are very commendable. Through consultations and enhanced content, more useful information is now being provided to non-members of the Council in the annual reports. We believe that both the analytical and the narrative quality of the work can be further enhanced with information provided in the monthly assessment of the presidency. The traditional

practice of subjecting the reports to an assessment by members of the Council is also encouraged.

Presidential statements constitute valuable means of providing information to non-members of the Council on the decisions of the Council. To improve their usefulness, they need to be more concrete and specific in terms of content. We also believe that the presidents of the Council should return to flexibility in addressing the media, while lead countries should be encouraged to provide more statements as appropriate.

The value of informal consultations should be enhanced through the provision of information to non-members of the Council on the outcomes of discussions as appropriate. The Council may also use other variants of this method, such as informal interactive discussions, in promoting inclusiveness in its work.

On interaction and dialogue with non-members of the Council, we welcome efforts made to increase interaction with the broader United Nations membership, troop- and police-contributing countries and regional organizations. We support the practice of holding informal consultations with General Assembly members, as introduced by Viet Nam in 2008 and sustained by Uganda in 2009, before the adoption of the annual report. Mindful of the value of local perspectives and specialized knowledge in guiding the decisions of the Council, we feel that it is necessary to maintain and improve the practice of inviting concerned countries and parties to deliberations on missions, mandates and other issues on the Council's agenda.

In terms of efficiency, Security Council field missions are valuable in enhancing the efficiency of the Council and in providing the right perspectives on local realities. Through dialogue with various actors at the national and regional levels, Council members become aware of the impact of their decisions. Our view is that the work of the Council would be greatly improved and enhanced by more visits and longer engagements with actors in Africa, considering the heavy presence of African issues on the agenda of the Security Council.

The timely circulation of the reports of the Secretary-General to Council members and to troop-contributing countries is crucial to the efficient work of the Council. The implementation of this requirement has been hindered by the cumbersome process of producing reports. The Council may need to consider reviewing the time frames required for the production of these reports on a case-by-case basis, and allocating more time for the submission of the reports.

At the World Summit in 2005, our leaders envisaged a reformed Council that would be broadly representative, democratic, efficient and indeed transparent — a Council would enjoy enhanced effectiveness and legitimacy in the implementation of its own decisions. Fortunately, the Council's working methods and procedures contain the essential tools for achieving these ideals. What is needed now, and urgently, is to overcome the challenges of inflexibility and the lack of will to implement note S/2006/507 and the subsequent notes of 2007 and 2008.

Mr. Wolff (United States of America): The United States appreciates the commitment of Japan to improving the working methods of the Security Council and your initiative, Mr. President, in convening this open debate. We should like to recognize your outstanding work, Sir, as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, and the excellent management of these issues by your Mission.

The Council has the solemn responsibility to take the primary role in preserving international peace and security on behalf of the entire membership of the United Nations. It is important that, in carrying out this role, our work be as effective, efficient and transparent as possible. Article 30 of the Charter of the United Nations mandates the Council to adopt its own rules of procedure. In doing so, the Council understands the importance of making sure that other Member States who are our partners in the maintenance of international peace and security are informed of and appropriately involved in the work of the Council.

The present debate focuses on the implementation of the annex to the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507. That note was the result of intensive work in the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Issues and was a significant step forward. The Security Council undertook a number of measures to improve the transparency of its work. All Council members have made significant contributions to this effort.

With respect to transparency, for example, the Council established a new practice whereby the new Council Presidents brief non-members of the Council

shortly after the adoption of the programme of work each month. The annual report of the Security Council includes a high level of detail that expands the information available to the general membership and provides a snapshot of the problems faced by the Council in its work and how these problems have been addressed.

The Council has also increased its interaction and dialogue with non-Council members in a variety of ways, including through informal discussions with interested parties to seek their views. Open Security Council meetings, such as the one we are in today, provide the opportunity for general Members to participate, and we are pleased that about 20 per cent of the membership is doing so today.

Another example was the open debate the Security Council organized on the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) last fall (see S/PV.6191). The Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) purposely developed an open and transparent three-day event for all United Nations Member States, relevant non-governmental organizations and civil society to present findings on the implementation of the resolution. The event was well attended and included a civil society plenary session side event organized by the Stanley Foundation. We again encourage as many Members as possible to attend open meetings, which are the Council's preferred method of meeting whenever possible.

The subsidiary bodies of the Council have also increased their number of open meetings. The Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the Permanent Representative of Turkey, Ambassador Apakan, in conjunction with Counter-Terrorism Executive Director Mike Smith, has already held two open meetings this year, the first on the challenge of effective judicial cooperation and the second on maritime security and terrorist acts committed at sea.

United Nations peacekeeping is one of the most important tools the Security Council has at its disposal, and we recognize the importance of close cooperation with troop- and police-contributing countries in this effort. In line with the New Horizon initiative of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Security Council has made a concerted effort to engage troop- and police-contributors in earlier and more meaningful consultation at least a week in advance of Security Council consultations on mandates. The Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations has also sought to improve the mechanisms for cooperation with troop- and police-contributing countries and to engage in regular dialogue about how to fine tune that cooperation.

Over the course of the past year, the Council has engaged Member States and other interested stakeholders in a series of open debates covering a range of issues on its peacekeeping agenda, including cooperation with troop- and police-contributing countries, peacekeeping reform, the relationship between peacebuilding and peacekeeping, mediation, and cooperation with regional organizations so that we can together ensure that United Nations peacekeeping continues to be an effective means to save lives, end conflict and rebuild shattered societies.

Making the work of the Council more efficient requires constant effort. In this regard, we all face the challenge of balancing the substance with the length of each of our statements so that we can convey our message as succinctly and clearly as possible. All of us, whether we are Council members or not, should strive to do better on this score so that meetings can be conducted in a manner that allows as many Member States to speak as possible, with as many other States present to hear them.

Today's debate offers an opportunity for the Council to hear first hand whether the practical applications of the innovations listed in presidential note S/2006/507 have helped Member States to follow the work of the Council. We intend to listen carefully to constructive comments in order to assess the effectiveness of practices and measures taken by the Council to enhance transparency, dialogue and efficiency. This information will inform the future efforts of the Council's Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I thank the delegation of Japan for having organized this open debate on the implementation of the presidential note of July 2006, contained in document S/2006/507. This debate provides the opportunity to assess the status of our ongoing efforts to improve the working methods of the Council and to allow non-members to share their observations and proposals.

We view the working methods as a tool to enable the Council to act with greater effectiveness. They must provide for the maintenance of a relationship of

transparency and interaction with the entire membership of the United Nations at the various stages of the decision-making process. The credibility and effective authority of Council decisions are linked to that process.

Expanding the openness of the Council and strengthening its transparency and its interaction with the rest of the United Nations are also means of pursuing the goal of effectiveness. Effectiveness is by no means opposed to openness; quite the contrary. The Council acts in the name of all Members of our Organization. It therefore cannot act effectively unless it respects two conditions. It must both take into account the concerns of Member States and give an account of its work to them. That is possible only through openness and transparency.

Since our most recent open debate on working methods in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), we have made tangible progress that has contributed to the transparency of Council decisions in a number of areas that are important to all the Members of the United Nations. First of all, cooperation in the crucial area of peacekeeping has been improved. In particular, it has been possible to establish more substantial dialogue between troop-contributing countries and the Council in the context of the Franco-British initiative on improving the planning and monitoring of peacekeeping operations, launched in January 2009. I underscore the interest that has been shown in organizing working meetings with troop- and police-contributing countries prior to Council consultations. That interstice allows for the effective participation of military advisors and specialists in police-related and political issues from the States providing contingents, and it improves background discussions. We must continue in this direction.

Secondly, dialogue with regional organizations has evolved, as evidenced by the Council's debate organized on this topic under the Chinese presidency in January 2010 (see S/PV.6257).

Finally, the Council is organizing an increasing number of open debates on a broad range of subjects in order to benefit from the opinions of experts, practitioners and the entire United Nations system. This allows it ultimately to better address the new challenges of peacekeeping and international security, improve its consideration of these issues, and take new measures as a result. The excellent quality of the texts recently adopted by the Council on threats related to terrorism, drug-trafficking, organized crime and corruption are proof of that.

In conclusion, I commend Japan's excellent work in its capacity as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions. My delegation contributes with interest to the current evaluation of document S/2006/507 and is prepared to learn new things from it on the basis of experience and practice.

We believe that the following principles must continue to guide our thinking. First, the Security Council's work must be appropriately distributed between public meetings and private consultations in order to facilitate the resolution of issues under consideration. In this regard, the members of the Council must bear in mind that they have considerable leeway in terms of organizing their meetings.

Secondly, the Council must continue to use that flexibility to innovate by establishing new meeting formats that are better adapted to the issues addressed and more regular and flexible. My delegation is thus in favour of establishing new formats that are more flexible at each phase of the Council's decision-making and negotiation process, without believing it necessary to codify them. The members of the Council must make the most of the flexibility that they have in their working methods and thus continue to engage in their considerations in a dynamic manner.

Mr. Barbalić (Bosnia and Herzegovina): Thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this important debate.

Bosnia and Herzegovina welcomes the efforts of the Security Council to improve its working methods, which have been particularly intensified in recent years. The first open debate in 1994 had historical significance and launched a true evolution, resulting in the adoption of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507. The measures contained in the note and their implementation reaffirm the principles of efficiency, transparency, interaction and dialogue with non-members, which are recognized not only by States members of the Security Council itself, but also by the broader United Nations membership. In today's debate, together with non-member States, we have the opportunity to exchange views and assess the implementation of the measures set out in the annex of

note S/2006/507, with the aim of improving their implementation.

Bosnia and Herzegovina attaches high importance to the implementation of the measures identified in document S/2006/507, for we are confident that it could help to promote the Security Council's transparency, interaction with the United Nations membership and efficiency.

We are grateful to the presidency for the concept paper (S/2010/165) on the implementation of document S/2006/507. We would also agree with the analysis provided in it. Indeed, the Security Council has made progress in implementing the measures set out in document S/2006/507 and, by doing so, has achieved better efficiency and transparency, as well as interaction and dialogue with non-members.

Furthermore, we share the same views when it comes to the challenges in implementing the measures. Some of these challenges could be addressed through additional efforts by the Security Council, including in the field of information-sharing, where there is room for improvement.

The general approach of Bosnia and Herzegovina to issues related to working methods is based on the need to find a proper and adequate balance among generally accepted principles or guidelines on efficiency, transparency and interaction and dialogue with non-members. These principles are compatible, but in practice they very often contradict each other.

Bearing in mind the primary responsibility of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security, we would like to express the position of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the following issues related to the working methods.

First, on consultations, the Security Council needs enough flexibility to allow it to choose the best format for a meeting depending on the issue being considered. While recognizing the importance of informal consultations to the decision-making process, we underline the need to balance informal consultations with public meetings. It is indicative that rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council states that "Unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public". Therefore, in the spirit of this rule, the Security Council should hold public meetings as often as possible. We also believe that it is particularly important to strengthen the interactive nature of public meetings.

Secondly, with respect to strengthening interactions with troop- and police-contributing countries, regional organizations, the Peacebuilding Commission, parties that have direct interests in an issue, and the broader United Nations membership, we welcome the progress and development of new practices, including informal interactive dialogues. We believe such interaction has the potential to enhance the quality of the Security Council's decisions and to generate a sense of common ownership, strengthening in that way the prospects for effective implementation. Of particular significance is the interaction between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, both in drawing up and in implementing mandates. We also urge the Secretariat to ensure the timely circulation of the reports prepared by the Secretary-General to the Security Council members, as well as to troop-contributing countries, thus contributing to the efficiency of their work.

We welcome increased interaction with regional and subregional organizations as important partners of the Security Council. The Security Council should also increase exchanges and the sharing of information with other United Nations bodies, especially the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Thirdly, on the way forward, the presidential note was designed to improve the efficiency of the work of the Security Council. We believe that, through its practical implementation, this goal will be largely achieved. We also believe that the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions should continue to work in order to agree on new measures in a reasonable time frame. Furthermore, we prefer the option of creating a new, consolidated text that could include the measures contained in notes S/2006/507, S/2007/784 and S/2008/847.

Finally, we are convinced that this open debate will significantly contribute to the future work of the Informal Working Group.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this timely open debate on the implementation of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507. Let me join other delegations in expressing our appreciation for Japan's contributions to improving the Council's working methods. Under your able chairmanship, the Informal Working Group on

Documentation and Other Procedural Questions has been looking into ways to enhance the Council's transparency, accountability and efficiency. Such efforts, which my delegation actively supports, will benefit from further interaction and dialogue with the wider membership today.

Under Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter, Member States confer on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree to carry out the decisions of the Council in accordance with the Charter. These two aspects — that the Council's authority is delegated and that its decisions bind sovereign States — explain and justify the interest of all delegations in the working methods of the Council.

Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter also provide indispensable parameters for the interaction between the Security Council and Member States at large. They establish the right of concerned parties to participate without a vote in the deliberations of the Council on matters affecting their interests.

The Council's constant dialogue with the wider membership on method and substance is therefore a political imperative. It is also beneficial to this organ, as it helps to make its decisions more inclusive and potentially more effective. Efforts must continue to be made to increase meaningful access for non-members in accordance with the Charter. This must apply to subsidiary bodies of the Security Council as well. They should seek the views of Member States with a legitimate interest in their areas of work or directly affected by their decisions, including by inviting representatives of such members to participate in meetings as appropriate.

Security Council consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries are another aspect of the organ's working methods that are especially important to the wider membership. Significant progress has been made in that area, but more can be done. For example, consultations should be held as early as possible in the negotiation of mandate renewals for peacekeeping missions so that the views of troop- and police-contributing countries can be considered by the Council fully and in a timely manner. Such interaction would be made easier and more effective if contributing countries had access to reports of the Secretary-General and draft resolutions as early as possible in the process.

Closer interaction between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission should be pursued. Let me express our support for the proposals made in that regard by the Permanent Representative of Austria.

Credible and systematic information sharing is key to consistent dialogue between Council members, non-members, interested parties and regional and subregional organizations. I would like to echo the words of the Permanent Representative of Nigeria in stressing the importance of more frequent dialogue with the African Union, taking into account the importance of such interaction to deliberations on many issues on the Council's agenda.

Private meetings may be needed, and often are, to help to effectively address an issue being considered by the Council. However, the Council should continue to strive to hold as many public meetings as possible, in line with the letter and the spirit of rule 48 of its provisional rules of procedure.

Those and other relevant issues are being currently discussed in the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions as we assess the implementation of presidential note S/2006/507. We hope that the Council will be able to agree on the text of a revised comprehensive presidential note. By doing so, we would provide Member States and the general public with a single user-friendly updated text comprising relevant practices relating to the working methods of the Council.

As Brazil has said in the past, improving the working methods of the Security Council is not sufficient to ensure its long-term transparency, accountability and legitimacy. For that to happen, its composition must reflect cotemporary political realities. The overwhelming support expressed in December 2009 for moving the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform to a text-based phase shows that the United Nations membership fully understands that political need.

Brazil continues to hold the view that the Council should be expanded in the permanent and non-permanent categories of membership, with the inclusion of developing countries in both. We also believe that there is ample support for that position. We will continue to work with like-minded delegations, in constant dialogue with all Member States, in favour of

a solution that can garner the widest possible political acceptance.

The President: I thank the Permanent Representative of Brazil for her kind words addressed to my country.

Mr. Issoze-Ngondet (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation duly appreciates the initiative to hold this debate, at a time when improving the working methods of the Security Council is increasingly necessary owing to the challenges facing international peace and security. Gabon welcomes the ongoing crucial role played by your country Japan, Mr. President, to promote greater transparency and efficiency in the Council's work. The concept paper that you have prepared for our consideration (see S/2010/165) sheds light on the issue that is on the agenda of today's debate.

We believe it timely, based on the recommendations contained in the annex to the note contained in document S/2006/507, approved by the Council in July 2006, to look into the functioning of this principal organ of the United Nations. My statement will focus on the two aspects of the issue at the centre of today's debate: the working methods that structure the Council's meetings and its relations with the Secretariat; and relations between the Council, non-member States and other United Nations bodies. While we ought to welcome the progress that the Council has already made in improving its working methods, it is nevertheless the case that many practices continue to have an impact on transparency and the Council's effectiveness in carrying out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

With regard to my first point, my delegation would like to speak of certain practices that to a great degree have an impact on the Council's productivity. First of all, there is sometimes a delay in the publication of Council documents in the six official languages of the United Nations. Unfortunately, in spite of some progress made in this area, we continue to see that many documents are published just a few days before the holding of Council meetings. This situation does not give Council members the time they need to consider the documents or to consult their capitals for instructions.

We also regret the failure to implement paragraphs 8 and 9 of the annex to the note contained in document S/2006/507, which called on the Secretariat to circulate briefing texts and to provide members with printed fact sheets on issues considered by the Council prior to the holding of informal consultations.

In addition to those necessary improvements, it also seems crucial to strengthen the equitable distribution of information between the Secretariat and members of the Council, so as to strengthen collective responsibility in the face of threats to international peace and security. It would also be advisable if, before they brief the Council, Special Representatives of the Secretary-General could, to the extent possible, hold consultations not only with the President of the Council but also with the other members of the Council, including the non-permanent members.

With regard to newly elected members, I welcome the opportunity provided to them to join private consultations several months prior to the actual commencement of their membership on the Council. Nevertheless, it would be desirable for countries presiding over the Council during the transition period to take the initiative, with the support of the Secretariat, of holding informational meetings for incoming members in order to consider practical examples relating to substantive issues and working methods of the Council.

With regard to the management of crises and conflicts, my delegation thinks it would be useful for the Council to strengthen the tools at its disposal to effectively follow the development of crisis situations at the regional and subregional levels. The excellent work done by the United Nations Office for West Africa made it possible for the Organization to quickly and effectively respond to the crisis in Guinea. We are certain that the future establishment of a United Nations office in Central Africa will strengthen the capacity of the Council to prevent and manage conflicts in that subregion, which continues to face numerous challenges in the areas of peace and security.

We continue to believe that the effective operationalization of regional offices will help to strengthen the Council's preventive capacities. The Council would of course benefit from further relying on such offices, not merely to increase the number of meetings it holds on emerging conflicts — as the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom aptly pointed out — but also to make those meetings more useful and effective.

Adopting resolutions is a major Council activity. In that regard, my delegation urges the authors of resolutions to undertake a greater number of inclusive consultations within the Council, so as to confer greater legitimacy on the resolutions that are adopted.

I should now like to turn to the second point of my statement, namely, relations between the Council and non-members. My delegation is pleased to note that, over the years, the Council has endeavoured to improve its interaction and dialogue with non-member States. For instance, we welcome the regular consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries, including those that are not members of the Security Council. The same goes for the President's ongoing consultations with the President of the General Assembly and with non-members of the Council on issues having an impact on international peace and security.

We also welcome the efforts made to make the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly more substantive and analytical.

These exchanges are all the more important in that they illustrate the need for the United Nations to deliver as one.

Regarding the participation of non-member States in Council meetings, we welcome the increasing frequency of open meetings. That enables non-member States to be involved and in that way to contribute to the search for solutions to collective security issues. The goal would be to make it possible to exchange up-to-date information and gather the views of those States, while respecting the principle of the confidentiality of information as set out in the Council's provisional rules of procedure. This practice can also ensure greater transparency and improved interaction between the Council and non-member States.

Improving the Council's working methods is a long-term endeavour that calls for tireless effort on our part. We must proceed in stages, with a firm determination to achieve concrete results. We continue to believe that a more open, more transparent and more inclusive Security Council would respond to modern-day demands. It is certainly the surest way to enhance the Council's legitimacy and effectiveness.

Mr. Rugunda (Uganda): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate to assess the implementation of the measures set out in the annex to the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507) and recent Security Council practice.

At the outset, Uganda commends the Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, chaired by Japan, for the good work it has done related to the working methods of the Council.

This debate provides an opportunity for a constructive exchange of views by Members of the United Nations on how the working methods of the Security Council can be further improved. The Security Council's agenda and workload are increasing in tandem with the fact that the international community is faced with challenging, complex situations and issues related to the maintenance of international peace and security. It is therefore essential that the Council conduct its work in an efficient and effective manner, while at the same time enhancing transparency. Although more needs to be done to that end, the Security Council has made some significant improvements in this regard.

We welcome the holding of more public meetings, as evidenced by the fact that 205 out of 228 formal meetings held from August 2008 to July 2009 were public. Some of the other notable improvements in transparency include the following: giving States figuring on the Council's agenda an opportunity to express their views and their concerns; holding consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries at least a week before the Council considers the reports of the Secretary-General on the respective missions; strengthening the working relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly, through monthly meetings between their respective Presidents; and holding informal consultations with Member States on a wide range of issues, including on how the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly can be continuously improved. The proposals and suggestions of Member States need to be taken into account.

We welcome the provision of timely, substantive and detailed briefings to Member States on the Council's programme of work. It is important to afford interested Member States the opportunity to hear briefings on matters of concern to them.

On the question of efficiency, given the workload of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, it is important

to build on the increasing spirit of constructive discussion and consensus-seeking. That will reduce instances of lengthy deliberation.

The Security Council continues to emphasize the important role that regional and subregional organizations play in conflict prevention, mediation and resolution and in peacebuilding. We welcome the strengthening of strategic partnerships with the African Union and other regional and subregional organizations, and we emphasize the need to further support building their respective capacities.

In conclusion, Uganda underscores the importance of the ongoing deliberations on the urgent need to reform the Security Council to better reflect present realities. The ongoing intergovernmental negotiations need to be calm and more effective, and they need to make definite progress.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Japan.

The issue of the working methods of the Security Council is crucial to the effective functioning of the Council. Enhancing transparency, efficiency and interaction with non-Council members benefits Council members and non-members alike. Such efforts are essential for the Security Council to fulfil its responsibility to act promptly and effectively for international peace and security.

In all these areas, the Security Council has made good progress in recent years. The note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507) was a useful compilation of the working methods of the Council, setting forth clearly the Council's working practices.

But it is also important for the Council to review the progress periodically and make necessary adjustments, in the light of current situation and taking into account comments from non-members of the Council. Some measures may need to be revisited; some others may need further effort for full implementation. We should take a pragmatic approach in order to meet sometimes conflicting requirements: first, to ensure prompt and effective action for international peace and security and, secondly, to gain the support of the wider United Nations membership for full implementation.

The Security Council has been making efforts to enhance the transparency of its work. More open meetings are now organized. The presidency provides a briefing to non-members of the Council on the programme of work at the beginning of month — and this month's was very well attended — and the programme is readily available on the Security Council website; the *Journal* sets out issues to be discussed not only in the Council but also in its subsidiary bodies. As President of the Security Council, I made it a practice this month to do a press stakeout after every consultations session. It is frequently not possible to share much of the content of the informal consultations because of their informal and ongoing nature. But I believe it is important for the Council to make an effort constantly to enhance transparency and share the thrust of the consultations to the extent that it will be conducive to effective implementation of its eventual decisions.

The Security Council's interaction and dialogue with non-members of the Council is essential to ensure that the Council makes informed decisions, taking into account the views of interested parties. Since a decision by the Council binds all Member States, close interaction with the broader United Nations membership, in particular countries directly involved or specially affected and countries and regional organizations with special contributions to make, will serve to enhance the effectiveness of the implementation of a decision by the Council.

Above all, the recent decision for an enhanced and timely dialogue with the troop-contributing and police-contributing countries is a welcome development. The Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations is a useful forum for such interaction.

The format of informal interactive dialogue allows the Security Council to have discussions with non-members of the Council that have a direct interest in the issues being discussed. Such dialogue has come to be utilized more frequently in recent years. The Security Council should continue to adopt the most appropriate modality of meeting flexibly to enhance its dialogue with interested parties.

Japan is pleased with the many positive comments on the usefulness of the 2006 note by the President in enhancing the efficiency of the work of the Council. A comprehensive compilation of the working methods — the so-called blue book, published by the Japanese Mission — is a useful handbook on how the

Council carries out its work, particularly for newly elected members. As the representative of Brazil stated, we believe that a periodic update of such a comprehensive note on working methods benefits members and non-members of the Council alike.

The increased participation of non-member States of the Council in its open meetings, such as the recent one on post-conflict peacebuilding (see S/PV.6299) and today's on working methods, is a welcome development. At the same time, we believe it important that the statements made in the meetings be focused and concise. We encourage all participants, members and non-members of the Council alike, to follow the guidelines established by the Council and to limit their statements in open meetings to five minutes or less in order to allow more delegations to take the floor and to make the meetings efficient and productive.

Regarding the way forward, the matter of working methods is important in the context of Security Council reform as one of the five key issues identified through the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. Genuine reform of the Council must consist of meaningful change in its composition, as well as improvements in its working methods. Japan looks forward to negotiations on Security Council reform on the basis of a text at the earliest possible date.

We welcome the participation of many non-members of the Council in today's debate, which reflects the strong interest of Member States in this issue. As the Chairman of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, Japan will follow up the specific points raised in today's debate.

I would like to conclude by reaffirming that members of the Council are making efforts to ensure access by non-members of the Council and members of the press to the temporary conference area, within the physical constraints, as far as possible in line with previous arrangements.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I give the floor to the representative of Liechtenstein.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): I have the honour to speak today, during the first part of my intervention, on behalf of the group of five small countries (S-5). The other members of the group — Costa Rica, Jordan, Singapore and Switzerland — will also participate in this debate in their national capacities.

We very much appreciate this opportunity to engage in a dialogue with the Council on its working methods. The S-5 is of the view that the decisions of the Security Council are particularly effective when they are made genuinely on behalf of the membership of the United Nations, as stipulated by the Charter. We have therefore consistently worked to encourage improvements in the working methods of the Council, in particular in the areas of transparency, access and inclusion. We continue to believe that the working methods are an indispensable part both of comprehensive reform of the Security Council and of an ongoing discussion within the Council itself. Holding periodic open debates on this topic is certainly a good approach, and again today we see that the membership has indeed a strong interest in this topic. We therefore commend you, Mr. President, on this initiative and thank you for capably steering the work of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

The S-5 group has been active for more than four years, and in 2006 tabled a draft resolution in the General Assembly (A/60/L.49). That text was never acted upon by the Assembly, in particular because, at around the same time, the Council adopted its presidential note, contained in document S/2006/507. We welcomed the adoption of the note, while expressing the view that additional and more far-reaching measures would be needed to achieve the goals of legitimacy, transparency and accountability that our leaders had agreed upon in the framework of the 2005 World Summit. Thus, while we welcome this opportunity to talk about the implementation of note S/2006/507, we will also address issues that go beyond the contents of that note, as the Council has itself actually done in its own practice.

The last open debate on this topic in August 2008 (see S/PV. 5968) resulted in no formal outcome, but certainly generated some recommendations on the implementation of document S/2006/507. Most of them have not been followed in the 18 months since. Generally speaking, the implementation of note S/2006/507 has been slow, partial and inconsistent. We appreciate the efforts carried out in the framework of the Informal Working Group, headed by Japan, to make

implementation more consistent and effective, and look forward to tangible results and concrete steps on implementation within the current calendar year. The S-5 will continue to reach out to the Council to make constructive and positive contributions to the improvements of working methods, both formally and informally.

I will now offer a few remarks, more in my national capacity, on a number of areas where we have been particularly active.

It is generally recognized that the annual report of the Security Council is a central channel of communication between the Council and the rest of the membership. It offers an opportunity for constructive dialogue and accountability. The annual report therefore figures prominently in note S/2006/507, even though the relevant parts are mostly repetitions of previous agreements. We have engaged with the Council members, as well as with the President of the General Assembly, to discuss possible improvements in the preparation and consideration of the report. We are very grateful for the open and positive conversations that we have had in that regard as, generally speaking, the opportunities that we have had to exchange views with the Security Council have always been very positive and constructive meetings.

The following are some of the main recommendations that came out of the discussions on the annual report.

On process, we believe that holding informal consultations during the preparation and before the adoption of the annual report could be very useful. Such consultations have been organized in the past two years by the delegations of Viet Nam and, last year, Uganda, and we are grateful to them. Such consultations offer a good opportunity to discuss, in particular, the introductory part of the annual report, which is the only part that includes political analysis.

We also believe that holding a public meeting, or even an open debate of the Council, when the report is adopted would be a useful measure. That would allow for more transparency, and the verbatim record could be taken into account when the report is discussed in the General Assembly. Our records indicate that the last such meeting was held in 2002 (see S/PV.4616).

On the format and contents of the report, we believe that making more constructive use of the monthly evaluations prepared by the respective presidencies could enhance the quality of the report. We are also missing an illustration of linkages between issues dealt with in the report, in particular between country situations and thematic issues. We also believe that the report does not cover any cross-cutting issues.

We believe that including a chapter in the report on the improvement of the working methods of the Council is necessary. It is often argued that the Council is the master of its own procedures and therefore of all matters related to working methods. There is therefore no better place than the annual report to inform Member States of relevant developments. In the past, we have seen no substantive language on working methods in the annual report.

Finally, we believe that more information on the work of the Informal Working Group could be useful. Of course, the Group is informal in nature, but is also the Council's only subsidiary body not to produce its own annual report. There are different ways of making more information available, including through the Council's website. As the S-5, we will continue to proactively engage with Council members and the President of the General Assembly on such ideas, and we hope that concrete improvements can be achieved in the framework of the next report.

The work of the subsidiary bodies is becoming ever more intense, complex and important. At the same time, access to their proceedings and information thereon continues to be difficult. We therefore attach particular importance to the implementation of the measure set out in paragraph 46 of the annex to note S/2006/507, which asks subsidiary bodies to seek the views of Member States that have a particular interest in a topic under discussion. In that spirit, we strongly welcomed the opportunity to meet as part of the S-5, with the Informal Working Group headed by Japan in July 2009 and were again very encouraged by the open exchange of views at that meeting.

In connection with the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al Qaeda and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, we again welcome the adoption of resolution 1904 (2009) in December 2009 and thank the Austrian presidency for its efforts in that respect. We believe that the resolution has brought about significant changes that were long overdue in the de-listing regime of the Council, including the

establishment of an ombudsperson. We therefore hope that the appointment process can be finalized soon and that the ombudsperson can start working as soon as possible.

In conclusion, the format of Council meetings is a key element of access and therefore highly relevant to our agenda in the S-5. The Council has been quite creative in developing new formats, as is illustrated by the very useful report that the organization Security Council Report prepared in advance of this debate. New formats that allow non-Council members access or enable concerned parties or organizations to participate include informal interactive discussions, informal interactive dialogues and what is usually called the Kosovo model. Taking these together with older formats such as Arria Formula meetings, there is now a wide range of mechanisms available to enhance access and transparency. We continue to believe that briefings by senior United Nations officials should always be made accessible to all Member States, without prejudice to the format of subsequent consultations. We also see potential in the format of specific meeting configurations, similar to those used by the Peacebuilding Commission with some success over the past years. This could facilitate the inclusion of non-members in the Council's deliberations.

Finally, allow me a word on the new arrangements for the Security Council. This is my first opportunity to participate in the new Security Council Chamber, which is surprisingly similar to the old Security Council Chamber. We are of the view that the temporary conference room arrangements should not lead to a new wall of secrecy, but should rather be taken as an opportunity for members to seek innovative ways to interact with interested parties and with the media.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Edrees (Egypt): I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. I would like at the outset to convey the Movement's appreciation to the Japanese presidency of the Security Council for convening this open debate to discuss the progress achieved in the implementation of the measures set out in the note by President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507, and for the concept paper dated 5 April 2010 (see S/2010/165) to direct the discussion towards enhancing the credibility, transparency and accountability of the work of the Security Council, particularly in terms of meeting the expectations of States that are not members of the Council.

The Non-Aligned Movement attaches great importance to the issue of improving the working methods of the Security Council. That is reflected in the comprehensive, clear and specific position stipulated in the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document adopted at the fifteenth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Sharm el-Sheik (S/2009/514, annex), as well as in several initiatives presented by the Movement throughout the years since the launching of the Security Council reform process. Those initiatives include, but are not limited to, the comprehensive negotiating paper submitted by the Movement in 1996, as contained in the report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters Related to the Security Council (A/51/47).

The Non-Aligned Movement believes that the Security Council should stop encroaching on the functions and powers of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council by addressing issues which traditionally fall within the competence of those organs. Moreover, the Security Council should avoid resorting to Chapter VII of the Charter as an umbrella for addressing issues that do not necessarily pose a threat to international peace and security and should fully utilize the provisions of other relevant chapters, where appropriate, including Chapters VI and VIII, before invoking Chapter VII, which should be a measure of last resort.

Furthermore, it is vital to continue to have regular interaction between the presidency of the Security Council and the wider membership of the United Nations, which can help to enhance the quality of the annual report of the Security Council. In the same context, the Security Council should submit, pursuant to Article 15, paragraph 1, and Article 24, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Charter, special reports for the consideration of the General Assembly and should fully take into account the recommendations of the Assembly on matters relating to international peace and security, consistent with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

In order to increase transparency, openness and consistency in exercising its mandated activities, the Security Council should increase the number of its public meetings, in accordance with Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, to take into account the views and contributions of the wider membership of the United Nations, particularly non-members of the Council whose issues are under discussion in the Council. Moreover, and unless there are exceptional circumstances, briefings by Special Envoys or Representatives of the Secretary-General and by members of the Secretariat should take place in public meetings.

The Non-Aligned Movement appreciates the steps taken to date through the Security Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, under your chairmanship, Mr. President, including those set out in the concept paper under consideration, to increase the transparency and the efficiency of the Security Council, as well as its interaction and dialogue with non-members of the Council. The Non-Aligned Movement further believes that more steps are needed to improve the working methods of the Council through the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The Movement is of the view that improving working methods requires strong political will, particularly that of the permanent members of the Council, and the adoption and implementation of many of the comprehensive proposals submitted by Member States over the years, including by the Non-Aligned Movement, to improve the working methods of the Council. Consequently, we look forward to intensified consideration of those proposals by the Security Council Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions in order to consider in depth the proposals of Member States, including the well known positions and papers of the Non-Aligned Movement concerning improving the working methods of the Security Council, and we call on the Security Council to adopt further measures in that regard.

That concludes my statement on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Allow me to add a few thoughts in my national capacity. I begin by fully associating my country with the statement I just made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group.

I stress the need to achieve tangible results on the issue of improving the working methods of the Security Council as an important part of the interlinked negotiables specified in General Assembly decision 62/557, through intergovernmental negotiations on the reform of the Security Council and the process of enlargement of the Council.

The Council, and particularly its permanent members, should work with the General Assembly to achieve the desired and long-anticipated results as soon as possible. Egypt believes that the main step that must be taken to improve the working methods of the Security Council is to achieve a balance in the power structure between the permanent and non-permanent members of the Council. The time has come for an agreement on a permanent set of rules of procedure to replace the current provisional rules, which have been in force for more than 60 years.

Moreover, the Informal Working Group dealing with this important subject in the Council should adopt official, bold measures that would consolidate the concept of equality between countries, promote justice in the way their issues are dealt with, enhance transparency, increase interaction and encourage efficiency.

Furthermore, it is imperative to revisit the relationship between the Security Council and the Organization's other principal organs in order to restore the missing institutional balance set forth in the Charter. The International Court of Justice has a major role to play in settling any dispute that may arise between these organs with respect to their mandates in accordance with the Charter. It should be utilized whenever necessary.

It is vital to give Member States whose issues are under consideration the opportunity to attend the informal consultations of the Council on an equal footing with the representatives of the Secretary-General. It is also vital to improve the quality of the annual report submitted by the Council to the General Assembly by making it more analytical and explanatory.

The working methods of the Council will not be improved unless we effectively address the misuse of the veto right, or the threat of use of the veto, in a

manner that would rationalize and restrict its use to cases where severe violations of human rights are being committed, including cases of genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and grave violations of international humanitarian law, as well as to the cessation of hostilities between belligerent parties and the election of the Secretary-General. Pending the achievement of this intermediate step towards the complete elimination of the veto, the right of the veto should be granted to all new permanent members joining the Security Council within the enlargement process.

In conclusion, what is missing is not additional proposals, but the additional political will to achieve real reform of the working methods of the Security Council, as well as all other negotiable terms in the Security Council reform process as outlined in General Assembly decision 62/557. The credibility and validity of the Security Council and its members will be seriously damaged unless we achieve those reforms as soon as possible.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Luxembourg.

Ms. Lucas (Luxembourg): I have the honour to address the Council on behalf of the Benelux countries — Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. First of all, I would like to thank the President of the Security Council for convening this debate and for his enduring commitment to enhance the working methods and procedures of the Council.

As emphasized in the concept paper for today's debate (see S/2010/165, annex), Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations mandates the Security Council to take prompt and effective action to maintain international peace and security on behalf of all Member States. In order to fulfil this responsibility, the Security Council has adapted, and should continue to adopt, a pragmatic and incremental approach when it comes to improving its working methods.

In August 2008, Belgium organized the last open debate on Security Council working methods and procedures during its presidency of the Council. At that time, it was decided to focus the debate on three closely interrelated issues, namely, transparency, interaction and efficiency. Concerning transparency, the Benelux countries welcome the fact that many efforts have been made to increase the transparency of the Security Council's work. For example, last year's resolution 1904 (2009), which reviewed the mandate of the Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Monitoring Team, considerably increased the transparency of the process for listing and delisting. The creation of an Office of the Ombudsperson further increases transparency, efficiency and interaction. We therefore hope that an ombudsperson will be appointed shortly.

With respect to the issue of access and interaction with non-members of the Council, we would like to make a number of remarks. First, as a general rule, we believe that the deliberations of Council members would be enriched if there were even more interaction with States and non-State actors associated with a conflict, which is especially important in the early stages of the consultations and should include private meetings. We welcome new formats like informal interactive discussions and informal interactive dialogues.

In the case of non-State actors, it is the Council's prerogative to decide which requests it is to grant and in which specific situation. However, we believe that the parties to a conflict should be able to submit their views to the Council in writing, which may decide to distribute them as Security Council documents. We further believe that interaction with non-State actors under the Arria formula is commendable and deserves further encouragement.

Secondly, given the increasing importance and involvement of regional and subregional organizations in dealing with challenges to peace and security, we believe that the Security Council benefits from enhanced cooperation with such organizations, both in public as in private deliberations. Furthermore, the fact that a regional organization represents the views of a larger group of Member States can contribute to shorter and more efficient debates, at least when those organizations are allowed to intervene early on in the debate.

Finally, the Benelux countries are strong proponents of further strengthening the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Security Council. We welcome the fact that the PBC Chairperson or the Chairs of the country-specific configurations of the PBC are regularly invited to brief the Council. We are convinced that the PBC and its country-specific configurations could also bring added value to the work of the Council in thematic areas,

such as women and peacebuilding, children and armed conflict, and the future of peacekeeping.

On efficiency, the Benelux countries agree with several of the ideas presented by the group of five small countries, in particular that key provisions of thematic resolutions could be incorporated into country-specific resolutions. That would also be a matter of coherence. The Council could also reflect on how best to assess whether its decisions are being implemented, analyze obstacles to implementation and suggest mechanisms to enhance implementation.

The proposals I have just mentioned could be enacted by the Security Council without delay. However, the responsibility for improving the relationship with the wider membership depends not only upon the Security Council. It is up to each of us to optimally use all means of interaction at hand. Today's debate provides an opportunity for feedback from the wider membership to the Security Council, and vice versa, in order to improve mutual understanding.

We thank Japan for its readiness to ensure follow-up to this debate in the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, which it chairs. We would indeed welcome an update of the note contained in document (S/2006/507). Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg will remain constructively engaged in the process of improving the working methods of the Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Finland.

Mr. Viinanen (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries — Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

First, allow me to thank Japan for its long-term commitment to improving the working methods of the Security Council. This debate on the implementation of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507 is welcome and timely. We also appreciate the tireless and constructive efforts of the group of five small countries on this issue.

The Security Council has the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. In fulfilling that task, maximum transparency and interaction with the wider membership of the United Nations is of paramount importance. Improving working methods enhances the Council's legitimacy as it acts on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations.

Transparency plays a key role. We think it is crucial that all Member States receive enough information about the Council's work. This is especially vital for small States, which rarely have the opportunity to serve as members of the Council. That is why we underscore the regularity and quality of briefings to non-members of the Council. It has been agreed previously by the members of the Council that interactive wrap-up sessions at the end of each presidency would be a useful tool for increasing openness and the availability of information. Such sessions provide an opportunity for assessing the Council's work and discussing lessons learned. This practice has unfortunately been discontinued, and the Nordic countries wish to encourage Council members to take it up again.

Regular open debates have increased the openness of the Council. The Nordic countries attach great importance to these discussions and commend Council members for upholding this practice. We believe, however, that there is scope for improving the quality of these debates. First, we would like to welcome consultation with non-member States in the process of drafting the concept papers for these debates. We also welcome an increased focus on how the thematic debates can become more action-oriented and can feed into future Council decisions on the topic, making sure that key provisions of the thematic resolutions are incorporated into country-specific resolutions.

In that context, I would like to commend the work of the independent not-for-profit organization Security Council Report, which has significantly increased transparency with its reporting. The improvements to the Council website and webcasts of the Council's meetings provided by the Secretariat also warrant mention.

The Nordic countries welcome the significant progress achieved in enhancing the transparency and fairness of the listing and de-listing procedures of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). Resolution 1904 (2009) and previous resolutions on the issue have added transparency and clarity to the procedures of the Committee by introducing a number of important innovations, such as periodic review of all the names on the 1267 list and

the obligation to add narrative summaries of reasons for their listing. The establishment of the office of the ombudsperson, as called for in resolution 1904 (2009), will mark an important milestone in further enhancing the transparency of the procedures of the Committee and in strengthening the due process rights of listed individuals and entities.

We are pleased to see that the ombudsman institution — an idea originally introduced by one of the Nordic countries — is now becoming a reality. Given the importance of the mandate, the Nordic countries now look forward to the swift appointment of the ombudsperson. Once fully implemented, resolution 1904 (2009) will represent an important step forward. The Nordic countries, however, believe that the procedures for listing and de-listing need to be kept under constant review and that the Council needs to remain open to further procedural improvements in the regime.

We welcome the past years' initiatives aiming to improve the interaction between the Council and troop- and police-contributing countries. Troop- and police-contributing countries should be better engaged in all stages of decision-making regarding peacekeeping operations, starting with the planning of the mandates. This would also be crucial for potential troop-contributors. Furthermore, the existing practice of informal consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries could be used more extensively and efficiently. In this regard, I want to mention the New Horizon initiative of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, which aims to develop United Nations peacekeeping activities. A number of the recommendations aim to improve the interaction among the Council, the Secretariat and troop- and police-contributing countries. We warmly welcome those proposals.

I would like to express my appreciation to Japan for organizing five meetings with troop-contributing countries last year during its chairmanship of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. The meetings provided a good opportunity for the Council to get input from those countries on various aspects of peacekeeping. We hope that this practice will continue.

I would also like to highlight the importance of promoting the relationship between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission in order to guarantee smooth transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding. We wish to emphasize our continued support for the practice of inviting Commission Chairs to brief the Council on a regular basis. There is still scope for increased cooperation and we see the current review of the Peacebuilding Commission as an opportunity to promote this important relationship.

The concept paper in document S/2010/165 highlights the challenges associated with the short time period between the election of non-permanent members and the beginning of their term. The annual workshop organized in Doral Arrowwood, sponsored by Finland, aims at addressing this problem, which is particularly relevant for smaller delegations. Its purpose is to give the new members an in-depth orientation and familiarization with the practices, procedures and working methods of the Council in order to help them to be ready from day one of their term. Reports of the workshops have been distributed as official documents of the Security Council in the hope that they will contribute to a better understanding of the complexity of the work of the Council.

The first time the Security Council's working methods were the topic of an open debate was in [illegible] (see S/PV.3483). The second was in 200[illegible] during the Belgian presidency (see S/PV.5968). As today's debate has illustrated, the topic is too important for an ad hoc approach. The Nordic countries would therefore like to suggest that the Council consider holding open debates on Security Council working methods on an annual basis.

Finally, the Nordic countries continue to emphasize the ongoing reform of the Council's working methods and procedures, so that it can fulfil its task in a more transparent, inclusive and participatory manner. At the same time, the yardstick of success cannot be openness and transparency per se, but the extent to which they improve the Council's ability to fulfil its responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.

The President: I thank the representative of Finland for organizing the orientation workshop every year. It is beneficial for all of us.

I now give the floor to the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Mr. Gonsalves (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines): I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the 14 States members of the Caribbean

Community (CARICOM), and to align CARICOM with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. CARICOM welcomes the initiative of Japan, in its capacity as President of the Security Council, for convening this open debate and for its concept paper of 1 April (see S/2010/165), which is invaluable in shaping today's debate on working methods. CARICOM would also like to thank the members of the Council for their insights today and their own inputs on this issue.

CARICOM, more than most, takes particular interest in the areas of transparency, efficiency and interaction with non-members. Our interest is born of our historical absence from this Chamber, and, indeed the appalling dearth of small island developing States (SIDS) in general among the membership of the Security Council. The last CARICOM State to serve on the Security Council began its term one decade ago. One year later, in 2001, Singapore became the last of the SIDS to hold Council membership. Seventy-three of the 192 United Nations Member States have never served on the Council. Of those 73 Member States, 29 are SIDS. Therefore, although SIDS comprise only 20 per cent of the United Nations membership, they represent a full 40 per cent of the States that have never served on the Council. Over 78 per cent of SIDS have never held a non-permanent seat on the Security Council — a percentage that is replicated within our own CARICOM region. As such, our historical position as Council outsiders has made CARICOM acutely sensitive to the practical effects of working methods on transparency and interaction with non-members. From our unenviable position of largely being on the outside looking in, CARICOM recognizes that recent measures and adjustments by the Council have resulted in some improvements. However, a great deal more can and must be done.

In that regard, and within the context and constraints of this open debate, CARICOM stresses the following four points. First, it is critical for the Security Council to accept that reform of its working methods, however far-reaching or effective, must necessarily take place within the context of wider Security Council reform, including an increase in permanent and non-permanent membership. Non-members will have little interest in interacting with a body whose legitimacy is compromised by its stodgy refusal to reflect changing global dynamics. Working methods therefore represent a single component of a comprehensive reform exercise, and must proceed in tandem with these complementary reforms.

I note parenthetically that many Members today bemoan the workload of the Council, but efficiency demands that most organizations, bodies and businesses, when faced with an increased workload, expand to deal with and handle the increased workload.

Secondly, as a general rule, the Security Council should refrain from encroaching upon the functions and powers that the Charter or tradition has placed within the purview of the General Assembly. It is far better for the Council to construe its mandate strictly, and do a small number of things well, than it is for it to be more expansive and do a host of tasks poorly. The seemingly inexorable mission creep of the Security Council is troubling, particularly to Member States like ours, which have been primarily creatures of the General Assembly alone. Any unnecessary encroachment by the 15 members of the Council into the functions and powers of the other 177 non-members will serve to undercut the compelling logic and unique goals under which the United Nations was established.

Thirdly, further adjustments to working methods are required to enhance the transparency, openness and interaction of the Council with the wider membership. CARICOM recognizes the Council's need for efficiency and, indeed, supports greatly enhancing this efficiency and effectiveness. However, optimizing transparency, interaction and efficiency is not a zero-sum exercise. In this regard, we view as particularly useful the suggestions that have been made and refined by the group of five small countries regarding, inter alia, reports, consultations and the implementation of decisions.

Fourthly, CARICOM is curious as to the broad and expansive reading that some States give to Article 30 of the Charter. The argument that only the Council — operating in a vacuum and advising itself — can adjust its working methods unfortunately raises more thorny questions than it answers. For example, CARICOM questions how, as a practical matter, working methods can be determined solely within a body in which two thirds of its members are replaced every few years. If we are to accept the concept paper's assertion that "[f]or many elected members, learning the procedural aspects of the Security Council is a challenge" (*S/2010/165, para. 12*) how can those elected members, in a limited

period of time, both learn and reform the working methods, only to be replaced by a host of new elected members that will have to repeat the process again? And why would incoming members that would not have contributed to the Council's working methods in any way feel any fealty to them? Only the permanent members of the Council would have any degree of influence or allegiance to such an arrangement.

It is impossible to read Article 30 in such a way as to make it immune from the General Assembly's explicit authority to discuss and make recommendations on any matters within the scope of the Charter relating to the functions of any organ of the United Nations — including the Council — and to make recommendations to the Council on these matters. Articles 10 through 12 of the Charter establish the scope of the General Assembly's powers and its limits with absolute clarity. The Council may have the responsibility of formally adopting its rules of procedure, but the General Assembly is clearly empowered not only to discuss the Council's working methods but to make recommendations to the Council, whether or not those recommendations touch on and concern the rules of procedure. Given the acknowledged role of the General Assembly in conferring legitimacy on bodies, decisions and norms, the Council would be well advised to adopt rather than to resist the relevant recommendations that may yet arise from the wider membership.

In conclusion, the welcome changes to the Council's methods thus far, as outlined in the concept paper, have served to highlight the promise and possibility of further beneficial changes. It is universally accepted, we believe, that the Council is not operating at its optimum efficiency, transparency, accessibility or effectiveness. Adjustments in working methods, as part and parcel of a wider range of reforms, can assist in remedying these acknowledged deficiencies. The continued evolution of the Council and its working methods is therefore necessary and desirable.

The Security Council is not a cocoon, a vacuum or an impregnable and fossilized bunker. It is of this world and of this membership. It must therefore reflect this world and respond to this membership. CARICOM hopes that one or more of our members will soon grace the inner sanctum of the Council again. That hope notwithstanding, we desire a Council whose working methods establish it as a nimble, efficient, transparent and accessible body that is open to the views of the wider membership and reflective of changing global realities.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Kamara (Sierra Leone): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the African Group at this open debate on the implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507) and to express our continued support for Japan's presidency in the month of April, and particularly for convening a session on this all important subject to assess the implementation of the measures set out in the annex to document S/2006/507, following the debate of August 2008 (see S/PV.5968).

At the outset, the African Group aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and further wishes to reiterate its correspondence of 23 December 2009 addressed to the facilitator of the ongoing reform process.

The fact that the rules of procedure of this very important organ of the Organization remain provisional clearly points to a lacuna in the working methods of the Council. Clearly, there is a missing link in the working methods of the Council, which makes it extremely expedient for the organ to undergo a reality check. This explains why the African Group has consistently called for a thorough reform that would make the Council responsive to the urgent needs of the increasingly turbulent world of the twenty-first century.

In addressing the theme of today's open debate on working methods, I must hasten to reaffirm that we support an expeditious and comprehensive reform process, embracing all the negotiable clusters, that will make the Security Council more representative, transparent, inclusive, accountable, effective and efficient in executing its responsibilities in order to ensure that its decisions are legitimate and representative of the views and positions of the wider membership.

We acknowledge that the Security Council has made significant progress in taking measures to promote some degree of efficiency and transparency in the manner in which it conducts its business, thanks to the efforts of its Informal Working Group on

Documentation and Other Procedural Questions and especially with the adoption of the note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507 and subsequent notes related to the working methods of the Council. We encourage further efforts in this direction through the practice of incoming Presidents to brief non-members on the programme of work at the beginning of each month. The introduction of written annual reports covering the operations of the subsidiary bodies, including the latest measure requiring each Council's presidency to prepare a published assessment of its operations, among other things, are all steps in the right direction of making the Council more responsive to the general membership.

Despite the aforementioned noteworthy attempts of the Council to live up to the expectations of its members and non-members, it is the considered view of the African Group that the measures are not far-reaching enough to endow the Council with sufficient capacity to deliver on its moral obligations as a representative, transparent, democratic and accountable decision-making body charged with the principal responsibility of the United Nations, and some of whose decisions are binding on the entire membership.

Africa favours a more accessible, democratic, representative, accountable and effective Security Council that responds to the exigencies of our time. In this connection, I should like to state the African common position on the Council's working methods, as adopted at the fourteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of the African Union in Addis Ababa on 31 January 2010, which complements the African common position on Security Council reform, as contained in the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration.

The Security Council should increase the number of public meetings, in accordance with Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter of the United Nations; allow for briefings by special envoys or special representatives of the Secretary-General and representatives of the Secretariat to take place in public meetings, unless there are exceptional circumstances; enhance its relationship with the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries, including through sustained, regular and timely interaction to allow for the effective planning and implementation of mission objectives; uphold the primacy of and respect for the Charter in connection with its functions and powers and in accordance with the provisions of Article 24 of the Charter; provide adequate and timely information on its activities to the general membership of the United Nations; avoid any attempt to use it to pursue national political agendas and ensure non-selectivity and impartiality in its work; refrain from resorting to Chapter VII of the Charter as an umbrella for addressing issues that do not necessarily pose a threat to international peace and security, but fully utilize the provisions of Chapters VI and VIII before invoking Chapter VII, which should be a measure of last resort, if necessary; avoid any recourse to the imposition, prolongation or extension of sanctions against any State under the pretext or with the aim of achieving the political objectives of one or a few States, rather than in the general interest of the international community; and formalize its provisional rules of procedure in order to improve its transparency and accountability.

Given that the Security Council and the General Assembly must work closely together within their respective spheres in seeking solutions to the plethora of challenges confronting the international community, we have emphasized the need for regular consultations and the effective and timely exchange and flow of information between the Assembly and the Council, and for the submission of more comprehensive and analytical reports to the General Assembly, including special subject-oriented reports and informative press releases on current issues of international concern.

Africa is strongly of the view that efforts aimed at restructuring the Security Council should not be subjected to a predetermined timetable. Even though we recognize the need to deal with the issue as a matter of urgency, we are of the view that all five clusters should be accorded the same sense of expediency.

The Sirte Declaration and the Ezulwini Consensus, which are our guiding instruments in the matter of the reform of the Security Council, further underscore the need to improve the balance of competence between the General Assembly and the Security Council. The proverbial delicate umbilical cord essentially interlinks all the clusters. Thus, no attempt should be made to exclude or even render any one of them less important in the reform process.

The President: I now call on the representative of Slovakia.

Mr. Koterec (Slovakia): I wish to start by commending you, Mr. President, and the delegation of Japan for having taken the important initiative to

convene this open debate on the implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council of 19 July 2006 (S/2006/507), and by stating our appreciation of the inspiring and succinct concept paper prepared for this occasion, contained in document S/2010/165. I also appreciate this timely opportunity to discuss matters of profound interest to all of the Members of the United Nations. It is our duty not only to take stock of the progress made on the working methods of the Security Council, but above all to take a step towards fostering better dynamics within the Security Council in this area.

We strongly believe that by increasing transparency, efficiency and interaction with non-members, the Council and the whole Organization can build in Member States the necessary trust and sense of ownership of the Council's decisions and actions, which we are all bound to implement under the Charter of the United Nations. In this regard, the efficiency and transparency of the Council's work, on the one hand, and its authority stemming from the Charter, on the other, are closely linked. Therefore, the efforts aimed at the full and timely implementation of Security Council decisions should take due account of the nature of the Council's decision-making mechanisms and its systematic interactions with non-members, especially those directly affected, concerned and interested by the topics on its agenda.

Slovakia proudly sees itself as part of the process of adjusting the Security Council's working methods to the current and future needs of the international community. In the year 2007, when Slovakia had the honour to chair the Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, we worked diligently to further the excellent work so ably commenced and carried out by the delegation of Japan in 2006.

Today, we are pleased to observe the progress that has been made, particularly in terms of transparency, the involvement of non-members in the work of the Council, and the speed of its decision-making process. It is evident that a more analytical and forward-looking approach benefits the Security Council and ultimately the United Nations membership as a whole. This progress enhances the credibility of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole as it contributes to building the confidence of the wider international community in the Organization.

We believe that working methods are one area of the reform process in which there have been considerable and commendable improvements. Of course, the time is not yet ripe for complacency, and we need to bear in mind that the full implementation of the note is a work in progress. Slovakia believes that further improvements are both desirable and possible in several areas, including strengthening the transparency and openness of the work of the Council, including and in particular regarding the work of its subsidiary bodies.

Further progress can be made in enhancing interaction between the Council and other Member States, in particular those directly affected, concerned and interested. This could be achieved through better use of private Council meetings and more regular use of Arria Formula meetings, and by the holding of regular consultations between the Council and non-members on relevant issues. We are very pleased to see that it has indeed recently become much more common for countries directly concerned to take the floor before Council members. We believe that this should be a standard practice in accordance with Article 32 of the Charter. We also appreciate the fact that representatives of regional and subregional organizations are now more often invited to take part in various forms of the work of the Council.

The mechanism of Security Council private meetings with troop-contributing countries should be prompt, flexible and substantive, in particular in cases of important or unexpected developments while implementing mission mandates.

The maximum relevance of the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly should be ensured, including by making it more substantive and analytical and by holding an interactive discussion with the General Assembly on it.

There should be provision for stronger interaction between bodies dealing with issues connected with peace and security, such as the Peacebuilding Commission or the Economic and Social Council, and the Security Council.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that Slovakia remains fully committed to the cause of increasing the transparency, effectiveness and efficiency of the Security Council, a process initiated by the decision of heads of State and Government at the 2005 World Summit and put in motion by the note S/2006/507 and

subsequent notes. We believe that adjusting the working methods of the Council is an important part of the overall endeavour to create and maintain effective multilateralism, and the best way to generate the broadest possible support for sustainable solutions in the area of peace and security.

The President: I now call on the representative of Italy.

Mr. Ragaglini (Italy): I wish to thank the Japanese presidency for having organized this open debate. We are pleased to see this topic return, the last such debate having been held in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968).

There are at least two merits to this type of discussion. It places all Member States in a position to know the main issues related to the Security Council's working methods, and it helps us to identify concrete solutions for improving them.

We have heard, also over the last weeks and months, some interesting ideas on improving working methods, beginning with the proposals of the group of small five countries, to which we pay tribute for the excellent work they have long promoted on this question. Italy is moving along the same lines and has put on the table a series of suggestions aimed at impacting the Security Council's working methods for the sake of greater transparency and greater access to and participation in the Council.

There are many aspects of the working methods that still need improvement: old concerns, such as the demand to increase and give renewed impetus to open meetings, for example; and more recent ones, like the issues of sanctions regimes and relationships with troop-contributing countries, where significant changes have been introduced but much remains to be done. The presidential note contained in document S/2006/507 is a significant point of reference in this process. We fully endorse an update of its contents, which could serve as a guide to all Member States in this endeavour.

It is not my intention today to make a list of what we have achieved and what we have not. I will focus my remarks instead on a matter of procedure and, if I may say so, of good will.

As we all know, some innovations to working methods would require amendments to the Charter. What I am proposing today, however, is a renewed commitment and effort by all Council Members to implement at least some of the measures we are discussing that do not require these amendments. In other words, we can use this debate to identify measures that can be enacted immediately. Let us consider, for example, the following three proposals on interaction with non-Council members.

There is a widely supported request to improve such interaction, especially with troop- and police-contributing countries. They should be more engaged in the Council's proceedings through open meetings and informal consultations, and by creating standard procedures for hearing their views. This is also true for the regional organizations most involved in questions being debated. If our goal is to interact with today's world, we certainly cannot exclude regional organizations.

There is also significant support for greater use of the Arria Formula, which allows civil society and non-governmental organizations to enter into dialogue with the Council.

Lastly, there are demands to increase recourse to open meetings and reduce to a minimum the number of closed meetings and informal consultations. At the very least, there should be post-meeting briefings by the President to non-member States or at least to interested States.

In another room of this building, we are engaged in a process of reform of the Security Council, in which a comprehensive package that entails amendments to the United Nations Charter, also on working methods, is being discussed. But implementing the proposals that I have just mentioned would not require a Charter amendment. We should therefore decide that these demands shall enter into the Council's practices effectively as soon as possible. In this way, we would provide an immediate answer to primary needs that are easy to fulfil.

I wish to say A final word on one prerequisite for a substantial and lasting reform of working methods. As we all know, the search for major innovations in working methods has been promoted most enthusiastically by countries that are not permanent members of the Council and are seeking access to a body on which they cannot be seated for perpetuity. Of these, a key role is played by the small States. This is understandable since, as we know, the current

exclusionary practices make Council membership virtually off-limits to them.

In our view, this is a clear demonstration of the fact that only a Council in which the principles of accountability, elections and rotation are enhanced would assure a genuine and ongoing effort towards reform of its working methods. Those who know that they will spend limited periods of time in the Council will do everything possible, once they get there, to ensure that in the future the room will be more open, accessible and transparent.

I conclude here in deference to the five-minute rule, another innovation in working methods that we can put into practice immediately.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

Mr. Khair (Jordan): I wish to extend the sincere appreciation of my delegation, Mr. President, for your initiative to hold this very useful and timely open debate on the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507. We are also very grateful for the very important concept paper that you have circulated.

Jordan associates itself with the statements made by the Permanent Representative of Liechtenstein on behalf of the group of five small countries and by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. Since Jordan is a major troop- and police-contributing country, I shall focus my comments on the working methods of the Security Council in the area of United Nations peacekeeping.

Progress was achieved last year in enhancing the working methods of the Security Council when dealing with peacekeeping-related issues. The Council has made noteworthy commitments and begun to put them into action. This can be seen in the holding of various open and inclusive thematic debates on peacekeeping issues, and also in the valuable work of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, chaired by Japan, which offers a forum for in-depth and interactive discussions.

Another significant positive development was the evolution of the French and British initiative on managing peacekeeping operations, which emphasized the importance of engaging with troop- and police-contributing countries. Another was the high-level meeting on peacekeeping held by the President of the United States, which reaffirmed the importance of renewing and strengthening cooperation among all the stakeholders, including the members of the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, as the only way to respond to the ever-growing challenges of United Nations peacekeeping.

By all accounts, these positive developments have allowed for a high-quality interactive dialogue among the relevant actors, and resulted in a great deal of goodwill and tangible change in the working methods. Yet, if this positive momentum is to be maintained and further fostered, the Council should ensure the full and effective implementation of resolution 1353 (2001) and presidential statement S/PRST/2009/24, which provide a framework for cooperation between the Security Council, the troop- and police-contributing countries, and the Secretariat. The consultation mechanisms and the detailed procedures laid out in these important reference documents should be optimally utilized so as to forge a stronger relationship between the Security Council and the troop- and police-contributing countries.

The sorely needed commitment of the wider membership to United Nations peacekeeping can be further strengthened by holding open, public meetings. In this regard, we encourage the Security Council to continue, deepen and expand the practice of holding thematic debates and open meetings related to peacekeeping, which allows the wider membership to contribute with their perspectives and ideas. These meetings should include input from the field, for example by the special representatives of the Secretary-General.

This practice has proven to be greatly beneficial, as we witnessed in the Council's debate on transition and exit strategies, held under the French presidency (see S/PV.6270). These meetings should also result in concrete advice or guidance by the Council based on the proposals of the participants and without prejudice to the role of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34).

We also encourage the President of the Security Council to brief the members of the C-34 during its sessions and, when appropriate, on the major developments and initiatives regarding peacekeeping in the Council. This will help to achieve more coordinated joint action. In the same vein, the President of the Security Council can arrange regular meetings with regional groups such as the Non-Aligned

Movement, the European Union and any other interested groups that contribute to peacekeeping, as well as regional organizations.

Strengthening consultation with troop-contributing countries should remain a priority for the Council's members. The experience and expertise of the troop- and police-contributing countries can substantially assist the Council in making appropriate, effective and timely decisions on United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Therefore, meaningful and substantial consultation should continue to be held between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries, including at the request of troop-contributing countries and during the entire life cycle of the peacekeeping missions. I need not reiterate the importance of these consultations to the troop- and police-contributing countries, in particular when it comes to the safety and security of their troops.

United Nations peacekeeping remains one of the international community's most effective tools for maintaining international peace and security. The demand for personnel, equipment and enabling assets for United Nations peacekeeping is thus likely to continue, and even grow. One should note that enhancing the working methods of the Security Council and its efficiency, transparency, openness, consistency and inclusiveness in the decision-making process is essential to sustaining the confidence and contribution of the current troop- and police-contributing countries in the Council. Furthermore, it can also contribute to broadening the base of contributors to United Nations peacekeeping in order to enhance the collective burden-sharing and to meet the future requirements of United Nations peacekeeping. Therefore, we encourage Council members to induce real and systematic change in its working methods. This change is absolutely necessary and certainly achievable.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Portugal.

Mr. Moraes Cabral (Portugal): I want to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this open meeting. We commend Japan's strong and constant commitment to this crucial issue.

I shall deliver a condensed version of my statement so that I can abide by the five-minute recommendation. The full version will be distributed. I will focus my remarks on the three areas identified in the concept paper (S/2010/165): transparency, interaction with non-members of the Council and efficiency. But I will add what, in our view, is another important aspect, that is, accountability, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

The note contained in document S/2006/507 was not the end of the journey. Surely, we must build on that important undertaking and acknowledge the fruits that its implementation has generated so far, which are rightly identified in the concept note. But we should not lose our ambition. We should never give up efforts to find further appropriate and effective ways to improve the Security Council's working methods. In that vein, I wish to recognize the important proposals made by the delegations of the five small countries, as well as to commend their continuous efforts and those of other delegations in advancing this agenda at the United Nations.

Elected members have historically been the ones to push for change in the working methods of the Council. We believe that they must build on available experience, in particular that of other elected members, to further this discussion and strengthen this agenda when they serve in the Council.

Enhancing the transparency, efficiency and accountability of the Council is the principal goal of this exercise. It is a substantive concern, not a formal one. The question is not just to open up the meetings of the Security Council when the real decision-making continues to be done behind closed doors. Nor is this a matter of debating openly or interacting with the general membership when decisions on matters discussed have already been shaped. It is not a matter of simply improving the image of the Security Council before the general membership.

The real question is how to make the Council more operational and efficient, with better use of time and resources and the full engagement and participation of all its members. How can we strengthen its global influence as a body that acts on behalf of all United Nations Members by bringing it closer to them? The real question is, ultimately, how to strengthen its authority through a more open and participatory decision-making process, through a better understanding of its decisions and through enhanced

accountability. In that regard, allow me to put forward seven concrete proposals.

First and foremost, the Council and its members must continuously strive to preserve the adequate involvement of all Council members, improve information exchange and promote participation and initiative in its internal decision-making process.

Secondly, we should strive to revive fully rule 48. The trend of meeting more and more often in public should be continued and strengthened, while reducing the number of informal consultations, which still today represent half the number of meetings of the Security Council.

Thirdly, direct dialogue with concerned States and parties, including troop contributors, should be increased. Enabling efficient interaction and consultation to take place with those States and parties in a formal setting of the Security Council or through private consultations, Arria Formula meetings or other creative formats, as appropriate, would immensely assist the Council in the process leading to its deliberations.

Fourthly, we must make sure that briefings by the Secretariat on situations under its consideration are, as a rule, delivered at Security Council meetings with the participation of non-members of the Council, thus avoiding, as much as possible, consultations of the whole for that purpose.

Fifthly, we should value the participation of the wider membership. That goal would be best served if, in open thematic debates, Member States outside the Security Council would speak first, and Security Council members at the end, while allowing some time between the meeting and the adoption of the possible outcome, thus demonstrating that the Council is listening and willing to incorporate valuable views from the wider membership — which is precisely the purpose of these open debates.

Sixthly, with regard to enhancing the role of Council presidencies, the Council should encourage a more active and substantive role in briefing delegations outside the Council, in presenting personal assessments on the work of the Council and in speaking to the press as means of enhancing public visibility of Council's work.

Finally, we believe it essential to give accountability a fuller meaning. In that sense, we have to identify practical ways of increasing the influence of the general membership in determining the agenda of the Security Council, just as we need to ensure better and more transparent annual Council reporting to the General Assembly. Reviving the former practice of including monthly assessments by the Presidents that reflect their perspectives on the substantive work of the Security Council would contribute to that goal. In that context, it is crucial to ensure that the Security Council continues to hold open debates like this one to assess regularly how its practice matches those aims and to collect valuable inputs from the wider membership on ways to improve it further.

My delegation is ready to cooperate with you, Mr. President, with the Council and with all other interested delegations to develop those and other concrete ideas to further this agenda as our common endeavour.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Tladi (South Africa): My delegation wishes thank you, Mr. President, for this opportunity to participate in this very important debate on the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507. We also wish to thank you not only for your work as President of the Council, but also in connection with your work on the working methods of the Council.

South Africa strongly supports the continued evaluation of the Security Council's working methods, in cooperation with the broader membership, as an essential element of the broader reform of the Security Council in order to make it more transparent and accountable, and thus to enhance the legitimacy of its mandate. In that regard, my delegation welcomes the modest improvements made in the working methods of the Council since the last open debate on the implementation of note S/2006/507, in 2008. We particularly welcome the improvements aimed at enhancing the Council's engagement with the broader membership of the United Nations.

As the presidency's concept paper (S/2010/165) reminds us, the Security Council is mandated by the Charter to act on behalf of the United Nations membership to ensure prompt and effective action on its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. That means that the Council represents the broader membership of the

United Nations in the execution of its mandate, which places particular responsibility on the Council to ensure that its work is transparent, predictable and consistent. In essence, it requires the Council to act in an accountable manner. It is therefore obligated to regularly engage with the broader membership in the execution of its mandate.

It is becoming increasingly self-evident that the Security Council cannot act alone in implementing its mandate. It needs credible partners, as envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. South Africa is proud to have been given the opportunity to contribute to building and enhancing cooperation between the Security Council and the African Union during its most recent tenure in the Council. Annual meetings between the Security Council and the African Union Peace and Security Council are now a regular feature of the Security Council's programme of work. We will continue to advocate for a strong and deeper relationship and cooperation between those two important organs in the maintenance of peace and security in Africa. It is our hope that those engagements will allow the Security Council to address more effectively the various conflicts on the African continent, which form such a large part of its agenda. South Africa is of the firm view that both Councils can benefit from that interaction and collectively improve the response of the international community to conflict situations, or even potential conflict situations.

It is critical that the Security Council quickly redeem itself vis-à-vis the view held by some that its mandate is only to approve peacekeeping operations. Peacemaking is not always merely equal to the deployment of troops to conflict situations. It is a continuum from mediation to conflict prevention to peacekeeping, where required, and to peacebuilding, peace consolidation and sustainable development. The United Nations must avail itself of different tools to deal with different situations. For example, there is growing consensus that peacekeeping and peacebuilding must not be seen as sequential, but rather should be seen and implemented in an integrated way. To what extent, therefore, is the Security Council prepared to allow sufficient space for the Peacebuilding Commission to participate in the development of Security Council mandates?

Further improvements are needed in the Council's engagement with troop- and police-contributing countries. It is our view that the Security Council's early engagement with troop- and police-contributing countries is a step in the right direction and should become entrenched. These engagements should be structured in a manner that will afford those countries the opportunity to directly contribute to the discussion in the Council relating to the renewal of mandates of peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping is after all a partnership between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

In addition to the aforementioned improvements, my delegation has also taken note with interest of the recent innovations in the Council on increasing its interactions with parties concerned with a conflict, such as engagements in 2009 with Sri Lanka, Chad, the African Union and the League of Arab States. South Africa reiterates its view that all parties involved in conflicts should be engaged in the process of the Council's deliberations and decision-making on issues on its agenda and when responding to crises. The Council can only benefit from such interactions. In our view, they will allow the Council to respond appropriately in the execution of its mandate to maintain international peace and security.

Having acknowledged the improvements, I now turn to remaining questions relating to the working methods of the Council. The question my delegation wants to ask is whether the Council has significantly improved its transparency. Even though some improvements have been recorded, it is our opinion that these are not sufficient. It is true that today more Council meetings are held in pubic than a few years ago. It is also true that recent innovations have increased engagement with relevant parties, including with troop- and police-contributing countries. We also acknowledge that the Council has improved the flow of information on its programme of work through regular monthly meeting to the membership by the presidency — a convention my delegation actively promoted during its tenure in the Council.

However, when we reflect on this body's decision-making process we have to conclude that there is need for improvement. The Council's deliberations on draft resolutions, for example, should be open for genuine deliberations amongst all of its members, including the elected 10, and should not be the exclusive domain of a few.

Like many other delegations, South Africa acknowledges the value of consultations of the whole

for the efficiency of the Council. However, it is incumbent on the members of the Security Council to be accountable in this process. South Africa wishes to encourage Council members to continue the practice of providing information to non-members on the outcome of consultations. I remind the Council that the Charter states that it acts on behalf of the United Nations membership. This necessarily implies that that membership has the right to remain informed of developments in the Council. Transparency in its work contributes to the credibility of the Council.

When the United Nations was established in 1945, South Africa fulfilled a central role in drafting the Charter and designing its institutions. We believe that the international community needs a Security Council. This body was established to maintain international peace and to provide the international community with an effective mechanism to prevent the outbreak of war. It has often failed but, fortunately, its successes outweigh its failures.

It is our view that for it to be more effective, the Council, first and foremost, needs to become more representative and requires expansion in both categories of its membership. Equally, it needs to address the problems in its working methods, of which we have named but a few, in an honest, transparent and effective manner. Maintaining the status quo will only contribute to the further erosion of its credibility and legitimacy as the premier organ mandated to ensure there is peace, security and stability in the world.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Slovenia.

Ms. Štiglic (Slovenia): Let me express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, for taking the initiative and convening today's open debate on the working methods of the Security Council and for preparing an excellent concept paper (S/2010/165, annex) to guide our discussion, focusing on the implementation of measures annexed to presidential note S/2006/507 of 19 July 2006. We believe it is both timely and appropriate for the Council and the wider United Nations membership to have this opportunity, since this is only the third time in 16 years that the Council has had a debate in an open format on this important issue.

We wish to express our appreciation for Japan's continued leadership and for the efforts of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions that you, Mr. President, currently chair. We also welcome and support the initiatives of the group of five small countries in this regard.

The increasingly numerous activities undertaken by the Security Council have brought with them an enhanced impact on the membership at large. Non-members of the Council should therefore be better informed about the Council's work and should have an opportunity to contribute to that work.

Further adapting the Security Council's working methods is one of the most important areas of reform of the Council, and one on which there is a broad sense of agreement. Slovenia welcomes the progress that has been made in recent years, in particular with regard to increasing the Council's transparency and efficiency, as well as its inclusiveness and interaction with non-member States. We welcome the progress achieved thus far with regard to regular briefings by the presidency to non-members at the beginning of each month, which provide a useful forecast of and information on the monthly programme of work of the Council. We also appreciate the consultations with non-members that have been organized by Uganda and Viet Nam during the past two years, before the adoption of the annual report of the Security Council.

However there is a need for increased and widened interaction and dialogue between the Security Council and other United Nations Members, particularly directly affected, concerned and interested States, in accordance with Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, and with relevant regional organizations.

Arria Formula meetings should be used more frequently. We welcome recent innovative approaches, such as informal interactive discussions and dialogue. In debates on situation-specific issues, parties directly affected or particularly interested should be allowed to speak prior to Council members to present their views. The timing and quality of interaction with troop- and police-contributing countries could be further improved.

We would welcome a further increase in the number of public meetings, in particular briefings by United Nations officials, as well as regular and timely briefings by Council members to non-members on the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. We welcome the holding of outcome-oriented thematic debates and we support the inclusion of key provisions of thematic resolutions in country-specific resolutions, as appropriate.

Non-members of the Council would also benefit if the President of the Security Council made draft resolutions and draft presidential statements available to non-member States as soon as they are introduced within informal consultations of the whole.

The Security Council should emphasize the importance of the rule of law in dealing with matters on its agenda. This embraces references to upholding and promoting international law and ensuring that its own decisions are firmly rooted in that body of law, including the Charter, general principles of law, international human rights law, international humanitarian law and international criminal law.

We welcome further consideration of ways to improve the transparency and the work of the sanctions committees, such as establishing the listing and de-listing procedures for individuals and entities and establishing an independent office of an ombudsman.

We urge the permanent members to consider not casting a non-concurring vote within the meaning of Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter in the event of genocide, crimes against humanity or serious violations of international humanitarian law.

In conclusion, we support initiatives to improve the efficiency of the Council's work and to improve its daily conduct of business — for example, allowing full participation of all members of the Council in the preparation of decisions, et cetera, and enhancing the capacity of newly elected members to fully discharge their duties. Security Council working methods have developed over the years. However they still remain a work in progress and require regular review and implementation to further increase the Council's transparency, accountability and efficiency. Involvement of the wider membership in the work of the Security Council will remain key to better serving the whole Organization.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Gutiérrez (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): I commend and congratulate you, Mr. President, for your initiative to include on the Council's programme of work this open debate, which offers us a further opportunity to exchange views and submit proposals on a matter of particular importance and of great interest to all Members of the Organization. After a gap of 18 months, the Security Council is holding another debate on its working methods. We see that as a positive sign of the commitment of Council members, in particular permanent members, to continually assess and seek to improve the Council's work. However, it is also important to remember that this topic is an integral part of the overall reform process of the Security Council, which involves the discussion of other issues that seek comprehensively to render the Council more transparent, efficient and legitimate.

From reading the paper annexed to your letter of 1 April, Sir, it is clear that the Security Council has implemented actions to make its work more transparent and to promote greater participation by non-member States and civil society actors. On 19 July 2006, the President of the Security Council issued a note (S/2006/507), whose annex contained a series of provisions seeking to update and modernize some areas of the working methods. It was drafted by a working group to which Peru, then a non-permanent member of the Council, contributed.

Document S/2006/507 set out a series of guidelines summarizing the practice of the Council that included additional adjustments to its procedures. That document is an important step forward in improving the working methods of the Security Council, which was furthered by the open debate held in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968) and the subsequent — I must say partial — implementation of some measures aimed at promoting greater openness in the Council's work.

However, in the view of my delegation, there remains ample room for increasing the transparency, effectiveness and accountability of the Council's work. It is essential to conduct a fair and comprehensive self-assessment that enables us to identify what new steps should be taken to enhance transparency, efficiency and interaction with non-members of the Council. I must underline that such ideas should be considered and developed in a balanced way in such a way that no one concept takes precedence over another. The need to seek greater efficiency in the Council's work should not be at the expense of reducing transparency or increasing openness, participation or access to information by non-members of the Council.

If the aforementioned principles are fully adopted as pillars of the working methods, it will be more feasible to implement the measures and suggestions raised by a great majority of delegations, which ultimately seek, as I have said, to make the Security

Council's work more legitimate and render it strong and efficient.

It is essential to strengthen the institutional mechanisms for interaction between the Security Council and the General Assembly that are already reflected in the Organization's Charter, such as in its Article 15, which provides that the General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council, and Article 24, which specifically provides that the Security Council will submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration. In that regard, it is unquestionable that States not members of the Council have a right to greater access to information that should be substantive, not merely descriptive, as is the case in the annual reports.

Clearly, this is directly linked to the question of working methods. The need to improve and strengthen the systems of interaction is extremely urgent, all the more as all of can see how the various cross-cutting issues, such as security, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, are becoming interconnected with development.

Undeniable, there is overwhelming agreement among Members on the need to make substantive and steady progress in improving the Council's working methods so that they heed and reflect the realities of the twenty-first century. This would help ensure that the Council is seen as an organ projecting legitimacy in the eyes not only of the membership but also of international public opinion. It is in that light that Peru hopes to see concrete progress by the Security Council in achieving that objective.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland, who is the last speaker this morning.

Mrs. Grau (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for having taken the initiative to convene this open debate. I also congratulate you on your active role as Chair of the Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions. The debate two years ago raised many useful ideas. That is why we look forward to having such discussions annually. My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Liechtenstein on behalf of the group of five small countries. Allow me to add some comments.

You have provided us, Sir, with an excellent concept paper (S/2010/165, annex). It shows that working methods have been substantially improved. It states that an increasing number of decisions taken by the Council need to be implemented by all States Members of the United Nations. It is thus essential that States not members of the Council be informed of its deliberations as soon as possible and be able to contribute to the Council's decision-making process.

Measures to improve the working methods can be divided into three categories: first, technical improvements that can be implemented quickly; secondly, existing practices that should be applied in a more systematic way; and, lastly, the politically more sensitive issues that we believe best resolved case by case.

From a purely technical perspective, effectiveness and transparency could be increased by using the latest information technology. For example, the briefing notes submitted by the Secretariat in informal consultations or the draft outcomes discussed by experts could be posted on the Council website.

We welcome the fact that in recent months non-member States have been regularly briefed on the monthly programme of work. However, we regret that briefings after informal consultations are still largely ad hoc and continue to depend on the goodwill and availability of certain members of the Council President's delegation. Given the growing tendency to organize meetings of experts, we strongly encourage the Council to promote transparency in that regard by announcing such meetings in the *Journal of the United Nations* and by organizing briefings on them. We welcome the greater written coverage of meetings of subsidiary bodies. Other measures should be considered to make the work of the subsidiary bodies more accessible.

With regard to politically sensitive matters, we have often seen the Council reluctant to address situations that are not on its formal agenda, but that nevertheless require its attention. Recently, the Council considered informal formats to address such situations. That is an interesting and innovative approach.

Interaction between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission has been improved. We support a regular dialogue between the Council and the President of that Commission. We would welcome the Council further involving the countries concerned and

inviting the Chairs of their respective configurations to participate in the relevant informal consultations.

Lastly, thematic issues, such as human rights, the protection of civilians and women and peace and security, should be further integrated in the discussions of country-specific situations and systematically included in the terms of reference of Security Council missions.

We hope that this open debate will lead to an in-depth review of presidential note S/2006/507 and will promote the adoption of an updated version of that note by the end of this year. An action plan for its implementation with a clear timeline could be prepared. We are ready to work with the Council in that process.

The President: I shall now suspend the meeting. It will resume at 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.20 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6300 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6300th meeting

Thursday, 22 April 2010, 3 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Okuda	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Vukašinović
	Brazil	Mr. Garcia
	China	Mr. Hu Bo
	France	Ms. Tétreau
	Gabon	Mr. Mandoukou Ombegue
	Lebanon	Mr. Jaber
	Mexico	Mr. Pintado
	Nigeria	Mr. Onowu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Mr. Gümrükçü
	Uganda	Mr. Muhumuza
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Adams
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2006/507)

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/165)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-32436 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.05 p.m.

The President: I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously.

I now give the floor to the representative of the Philippines.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): I join the other delegations in congratulating Japan on its presidency this month. Your outstanding and inspiring leadership, Sir, have proven valuable to the work of the Security Council.

We appreciate Japan's proactive and enthusiastic role in advancing today's issue. We commend Japan for circulating a concept paper (S/2010/165) for the Security Council's debate on the implementation of the measures set out in the note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507. The concept paper provides us with a concise and comprehensive view of the present work of the Council and has been very useful in guiding our debate today.

The Philippines associates itself with the statement made by the representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. The enthusiastic participation of many Member States in this debate reflects the utmost importance they attach to this issue. Our delegation strongly shares that sentiment. The Philippines is among those countries that consider the improvement of the working methods of the Council to be crucial, not just to the Council's effectiveness but also to the overall success of the United Nations system. Its working methods are key to the Council's role as a guardian of international peace and security, for they greatly influence and enhance its effectiveness in performing its mandate.

Various attempts have been made to increase the Council's transparency and openness. We saw in recent months the efforts made by the Council to provide more and timely information regarding its work programme and schedule and the issues to be tackled by the incoming president of the Council. We are indeed pleased by these positive developments and urge the Council members to continue this practice.

Recently, we have also observed a higher degree of interaction and dialogue between Council members and non-members, especially on such relevant issues as peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Indeed, the greater participation of non-members to express their views on issues germane to them creates the impression that the Council also cares about the views of non-members. Not only does this reflect a growing sense of inclusiveness, but it also keeps unilateralism at bay.

However, as new developments and threats emerge, the work of the Council continues to grow and expand. These, of course, absorb the Council's resources, energy and attention. There is a need to refocus the Council's attention on the basic and core issues — peace and security — in order to achieve greater efficiency. The Council should therefore refrain, if possible, from tackling cross-cutting issues such as those more appropriately dealt with by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council or other United Nations organs. Having said this, however, the Philippines wishes to reiterate some of its previous proposals for specific amendments contained in the paper that the Philippine Mission transmitted to the General Assembly and which it gave to the permanent missions in February last year.

Mr. President, your laudable effort to convene this debate has truly rekindled the enthusiasm of non-members of the Security Council to share their views and has renewed their hope that the Council is capable of improving its working methods, which in turn will redound to the benefit of the membership of the United Nations and the international community as a whole.

The reform of the Council's working methods is itself a work in progress and much remains to be done. To this end, let me assure you that the Philippines is ready and willing to support the work of Japan and other like-minded States in achieving this lofty goal.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): Canada welcomes this opportunity to address the Security Council on this important issue. At the outset, my delegation would like to commend Japan for its long-standing commitment and very practical contributions to the discussion of how to improve the working methods of the Council.

The working methods of the Council are of interest to Council members and non-members alike.

Canada believes that there is a need for a continuing dialogue on this issue. Canada would therefore support the idea of regular annual or biannual open debates on this subject.

The Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and the authority to make decisions that are binding on all Member States. Given the heavy responsibility entrusted to the Council, there is a need to ensure that it is accountable, inclusive and transparent in its decision-making. The presidential note contained in document S/2006/507 outlines a number of important areas where the Council could improve its working methods to make them more transparent and more efficient. In the past four years, there has been some progress in implementing those measures. However, this implementation has not been consistent, and even those measures that have been implemented seem to rely disproportionately on the individual efforts of the Council President or elected members of the Council.

Canada believes that full implementation of the measures contained in presidential note S/2006/507 would go a long way towards creating a Security Council that is more transparent, efficient and accountable. It is for this reason that Canada requested a comprehensive review of the presidential note during the open debate two years ago. It is our sincere hope that the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions can undertake such a review and present its findings to the Council before the end of the year.

For the vast majority of Member States, membership of the Security Council is a rare occurrence, yet the decisions of the Security Council affect all Member States greatly. While it is clear that each Council member must act in accordance with its national responsibilities, the wider membership has a legitimate interest in knowing how these decisions are made and in contributing to them as appropriate.

One practical suggestion for improving the contribution of non-members of the Council is to resume the holding of orientation debates before discussions are scheduled on specific items on the Council's agenda. In recent years, most of the open debates of the Council have been on thematic issues. Canada would urge the Council to return to the practice of having orientation debates on country-specific agenda items, as well as on thematic issues. That would allow non-members of the Council to have input into these discussions before decisions are made.

Canada would also urge the Council to increase the transparency of its deliberations. While Canada acknowledges that private meetings of the Council are sometimes necessary, there is also a need to keep the wider membership informed about the Council's deliberations. In practical terms, this means that the Council should hold as many meetings as possible in public format. When there is a need to hold closed consultations, the members of the Council should provide systematic briefings to other interested Member States.

One area in which the Council has recently made some progress is in consultations with troop-contributing countries, and I would like to thank the delegation of Japan for its efforts in this regard as Chair of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. In the past year, there has been a noticeable improvement in the quality of the consultations with troop-contributing countries. The most effective change has been an improvement in the scheduling of consultations so that they occur before the decision on a peacekeeping mission's mandate has already been taken. This allows the Council to benefit from the significant experience of the troop-contributing countries and also ensures that there is broad support for Council decisions.

However, these improved consultations still seem to be carried out in a rather ad hoc manner. Canada would urge the Council to systematize this practice so that the input of troop contributors can be heard before the discussions on all peacekeeping mandates. A more predictable consultation mechanism would also improve the participation of troop-contributing countries and the quality of their input, thereby increasing the information available to the Council for its deliberations.

(*spoke in French*)

While presidential note S/2006/507 was an important step forward, it is also worth noting that the United Nations has changed over the past four years. As a result, there are other areas in which improvements could be made to Council working methods beyond those outlined in the presidential note. One of the most important developments of recent years is the evolution of the Peacebuilding Commission, which has a unique role to play in

assessing, prioritizing, and mobilizing support for key peacebuilding challenges that fall outside the core competencies of a peacekeeping operation.

The Commission also works to ensure that the efforts of the many actors involved in peacebuilding are better coordinated, including with respect to the mandate of United Nations missions. The holding of regular briefings is a good start, but closer and more substantive interaction between the Council and the Commission is needed. Canada would therefore recommend that the Security Council cooperate systematically with the Peacebuilding Commission earlier in the post-conflict period.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you again for having convened this meeting, Sir. Reform of the Security Council's working methods is an ongoing process to which all Member States must continue to contribute. However, it is also an area in which early action is possible in order to achieve tangible results to the benefit of Member States. Canada looks forward to continuing to engage constructively in this process in the months ahead.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of New Zealand.

Mr. McLay (New Zealand): New Zealand welcomes the opportunity to contribute today and thanks the delegation of Japan, which has a long and commendable history of promoting reform of Security Council working methods, for convening this debate.

New Zealand strongly believes that, in addition to any structural change, there needs to be wide-ranging reform of the Council's working methods. In that regard, New Zealand rejects outright the suggestion that the Council's working methods are a matter for the Council alone to decide. That is no more legitimate than arguing that citizens have no valid interest in the proceedings of their countries' courts or in the rules and procedures of the legislatures that they elect. The Council has the authority to make binding decisions. Its permanent members are here by agreement of the international community, as embodied in the United Nations Charter. And the remaining members are elected to serve the 187 Member States that do not enjoy the privilege of permanently sitting in the Council Chamber, often behind closed doors.

For those 187 — the overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership — this Council's working methods are vitally important. They affect our ability to understand and contribute to the Council's work and, in the end, like the Council's structure, directly affect the legitimacy of the Council itself. Over time, an opaque and insular Security Council will lose credibility and will not enjoy the support of the wider membership, and its role in maintaining international peace and security could diminish and perhaps, over time, even be usurped. Such a Council would at best be viewed as irrelevant; at worst, illegitimate. Furthermore, such is the overriding importance of the Security Council's role in maintaining global peace and security that its legitimacy bears directly on the very legitimacy of the United Nations itself. New Zealand believes that it is in everyone's interest to ensure that both the United Nations and its Security Council are credible, effective and strong.

The presidential note in document S/2006/507 sets out over 60 concrete steps that might improve the Council's working methods and, in turn, its legitimacy. They are steps that, as Japan's concept paper (S/2010/165) makes clear, would increase the Council's transparency, its interaction with non-members and its efficiency. In the interests of time, I will highlight just five proposals that New Zealand considers important.

First, while we accept that, in line with rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure, private consultations are sometimes necessary, overall we believe that Council meetings should be public whenever possible. Further, essential information should be shared at those meetings, and such meetings should be outcome-focused, lest the issues be diluted by a day's worth of bland statements from Council members and non-members alike.

Secondly, thanks to the efforts of Japan, France, the United Kingdom and others, the Council's interactions with troop- and police-contributing countries have greatly improved. However, as the recent discussions on Chad demonstrated, key troop contributors are sometimes still unable to participate meaningfully in timely and sustained high-level consultations with Council members. To address this, New Zealand advocates the creative use of such Council meeting formats as informal interactive dialogues. As Council President during the Rwandan crisis in 1994, New Zealand organized regular informal meetings with troop-contributing countries. Our

experience in that case and others convinces us that such informal meetings can allow very useful communication and that they should be used more regularly. And of course, they better reflect the spirit of our Charter.

Thirdly, Member States with which the Council is dealing should also be able to participate meaningfully in high-level Council consultations. The informal interactive dialogue format used last year in discussions on Sri Lanka, and more recently on Chad, worked well. This format should become a standard Council tool for sustained interaction with non-members whose cooperation is sought by the Council. It would provide opportunities for prevention of conflict and better use of the Council's role as set out in Chapter VI of the Charter. However, while recognizing that such issues do often require private discussion, the Council also needs to remember the need to maintain a balance of transparency.

Fourthly, New Zealand would like to see draft Council documents shared with non-members sooner and with more frequency, and believes that interested parties should have greater influence in the preparation of those documents. Such sharing could be part of wider efforts to revitalize the way the Council and its secretariat make use of modern information technology. Websites, such as that used by Slovakia during its Council tenure, and now by *Security Council Report*, are good current examples, but more systematic sharing through email and other modern media would be welcome.

Finally, as France and others have pointed out, more effective discussions among Council members are desirable. New Zealand recalls that, during its most recent term on the Council, informal discussions were both interactive and strategic and allowed for substantive discussion and negotiation. Interactive engagement would improve Council effectiveness and collegiality and should be encouraged.

Those are just five of the many changes that could improve this Council's working methods. As a next step, New Zealand looks forward to Japan, as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, issuing a revised version of presidential note S/2006/507, and urges that it be accompanied by a concrete implementation plan, and we call for regular, annual or biannual debates, to assess that implementation.

If the Security Council is to maintain international peace and security, it must have the support of the Member States from which it derives its authority. Those Member States — the 187 non-permanent members — deserve better transparency, they are entitled to better interaction and, above all, they seek a more effective Security Council. Such outcomes may be in the hands of the members of this Council, but they are in the interests of all Member States.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Goledzinowski (Australia): Mr. President, I thank you for convening this important debate. I would like first to take this opportunity to commend the efforts of Japan to advance the Council's working methods, including your role as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions now and in 2006. The Working Group, of course, gave us the presidential note in document S/2006/507, which we are considering here today.

Australia supports a Council that better reflects the modern world and that is well placed to meet its demands. This, of course, involves reforming the composition of the Council. But improving the Council's working methods, including transparency, is an integral part of working towards that goal. We appreciated the point made this morning by the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, representing the Caribbean Community, in regard to the particular needs of the small island developing States. His is a sentiment that we share, together with our colleagues from the Pacific region.

The basic mindset of the Council should be one of active accountability and deliberate transparency. We, the Members of the United Nations, expect the Council to regard the need to justify its decisions, to share information, to consult widely and to accept input not as burdensome or optional extras, but as core elements of its working methods.

With this in mind, we recall the last debate on the Council's working methods in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), and in particular we recall Costa Rica's suggestion that Member States should convene at least

every two years to monitor progress on reform of working methods. The idea of the Ambassador of Costa Rica, as I remember it, was that every elected member should have at least one opportunity during its term to participate in such a debate. When we heard Costa Rica's idea, we immediately endorsed it. It is therefore very pleasing to note that Japan has acted to bring this about. The next step, we would suggest respectfully, is to ensure that this debate be institutionalized on at least a biennial basis.

There are things to welcome and there are plenty of things to do more of. Monthly briefings by the Council President are appreciated; their quality has improved in recent years. We welcome recent innovations to improve the quality of consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries. Informal interactive dialogues do seem to have been useful, although Council members must keep in mind the need to provide transparency to others when it uses such closed-format vehicles. The innovations with regard to the process pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) and the creation of an ombudsman are also welcome.

As we have heard from so many speakers, including the representative of Canada most recently, greater interaction with the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) is important. But as we mentioned in this room just last week, we consider it vital that peacebuilding needs be considered at the inception of a peacekeeping mission. This will demand a closer and more organic relationship between this Council and the PBC throughout the Council's consideration of a situation. The precise modalities for achieving that should be the subject of further discussion between the Council and the PBC.

We welcome the Council's engagement with the Chairs of the respective PBC country-specific configurations in its mandate renewal deliberations. This is a good first step. But how should broader peacebuilding considerations be brought to the attention of the Council when there is no PBC country-specific configuration? How does the Council, in planning a peacekeeping mission, engage with all interested peacebuilding actors — including members of the United Nations family, the international financial institutions and the relevant regional and subregional organizations — to ensure that all these actors are working in unison and that the early peacebuilding tasks undertaken by peacekeepers are part of a coherent, integrated plan? These are the sorts of questions the Council will need to address.

We join others who believe that there is much more that needs to be done. The work by the so-called group of five small countries, for example, is impressive and we agree with their recommendations, including ensuring, as the representative of Liechtenstein said earlier today, that briefings by United Nations officials are, as far as possible, accessible to all Member States. We also agree that consultations with non-members should take place as part of the standard operating procedures, and draft resolutions and presidential statements be made available to non-members of the Council once they are introduced in informal consultations. We think that the points made by the delegation of Jordan in regard to interaction with troop- and police-contributing countries were very well made.

We continue to believe that, fundamentally, the Council needs to commit to a vision of active accountability and deliberate transparency. It needs to establish metrics, qualitative and quantitative, and assess progress against them with a more effective annual report, although the earlier remarks this morning in praise of the annual report we think were entirely apposite. It should also keep in mind external assessors, such as *Security Council Report*, and harness technology, not just to bring the Council into the twenty-first century, but to look ahead as to how it should operate in five or 10 years time.

It is true that the Council's efficiency depends in part on the performance of we the non-members. We should contribute to open debates in an interactive and responsive manner rather than just read statements prepared days in advance that too often exceed time limits and disrespect our fellow members.

On this question of open debates, we were particularly struck by a suggestion made just before lunch by the Ambassador of Portugal. He suggested that, in these open debates, perhaps non-members should speak first and Council members last. We would encourage Council members to consider this. We would certainly encourage Council members to listen more attentively when non-members speak, perhaps even at the level of permanent representative. It would afford an opportunity for Council members to reflect and comment on the ideas they have heard in the course of the day at the end of the day. We think that

would be interesting, and we would appreciate the Council's thoughts on that idea.

In conclusion, there is a tradition in the Australian army that the officers eat only after the troops have been fed. Perhaps that could be food for thought.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

Mr. Hernández-Milian (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, and your delegation for convening this important debate and for your leadership of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions. We hope that this open meeting will establish the practice of reviewing Security Council working methods regularly with other States Members of the Organization, as we have suggested in the past and has been stressed by the representative of Australia, a country which, among others, has supported that measure.

Costa Rica associates itself with the statement made this morning by the Permanent Representative of Liechtenstein on behalf of the group of five small countries. My delegation, as an active member of that group, is contributing with a sense of responsibility to the consideration of various elements of Security Council reform, and specifically of its working methods.

During its recent tenure as an elected member of the Council, Costa Rica contributed to the significant progress made by this organ in the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507. Our country welcomed the increase in the number of open meetings compared to previous years. This trend should be extended because we are still far from complying with the provisional rules of procedure establishing the public nature of Council meetings as a general rule. As we have said on other occasions, the Secretariat has the duty to facilitate the application of this rule, offering open formats for all meetings as the first option in the draft programme of work that it prepares for each presidency. It would be for members of the Council to argue for and convince the Council of the need to use the private format on an exceptional basis, when necessary.

The Council has also made greater efforts to interact in greater depth and a timelier manner with troop- and police-contributing countries. The Council should maintain the new practice of holding private meetings with those countries at least one week before it considers an item so that their points of view can be taken into account in decisions. We urge troop-contributing countries to make greater and better use of these meetings, to contribute with information and the views of their mission personnel, and to refer to specific issues relating to the implementation of mandates in the field.

The Security Council has committed to implementing the measures contained in the note contained in document S/2006/507. My country considers that the progress made in these and other fields should not depend on the will of each individual presidency, but should be affirmed in the daily practice of the Council.

Costa Rica also has first-hand experience of some other ways in which this organ still does not comply with agreed measures. The desire for all Council members to participate in the preparation and drafting of resolutions and other Council products is reaffirmed in note S/2006/507. However, in practice some very sensitive issues are somehow removed from the Council's purview and essentially defined by the permanent members, other States that are not members of the Council and the so-called groups of friends. As recommended in note S/2006/507, Costa Rica is in favour of consultations with interested States. However, these should never be to the detriment of the full participation of the elected members of the Security Council. All issues of international peace and security are of interest to and within the competence of all members.

We welcome the Secretariat's ongoing internal review of its reporting mechanisms in response to the reiterated concerns of Member States on the tardy circulation of the reports of the Secretary-General. As stated in paragraph 11 of note S/2006/507, these reports "should be circulated to Council members and made available in all official languages of the United Nations at least four working days before the Council is scheduled to consider them", including Council meetings with troop-contributing countries. Should there be significant changes in the situation in the field, these can be communicated via an addendum to the reports. The fact that reports need to be updated should not be an excuse for circulating them late.

Although my country welcomes the practice of holding monthly open debates, it is important to consider the use the Council makes of such debates. This format can be very useful not just in addressing thematic issues, as is currently the case, but also in learning about situations in various countries, whether they are new or familiar to the Council. We are also concerned about the message sent when decisions adopted by the Council in such debates are agreed upon before they take place. This would seem to indicate that the Council is not interested in hearing the points of view of the broader membership before making decisions. We invite the Council to change this practice and to initiate the negotiation of resolutions and presidential statements after having heard from the rest of the members, and not to adopt them on the same day, as has been its custom to date.

Beyond the contents of note S/2006/507, in December last year my country submitted a draft note by the President to the Informal Working Group on Documentation, with the aim of ensuring the inclusive and uniform participation of all members in Security Council missions to the field. Our intention in doing so was to clarify a number of administrative and procedural aspects of Council missions. We hope that this proposal will receive the attention of the Informal Working Group, and my country remains fully available to contribute to this process. I take this opportunity to congratulate the delegation of Japan for its leadership on this issue.

Finally, it is important to mention a mandated task on which the Security Council still falls short, although it is established in the very Charter of the United Nations. We refer to the submission of special reports to the General Assembly, a tool which could be of use in such situations as the establishment of a new peacekeeping operation or sanctions regime, or the non-action of the Council due to the use of the veto, among others.

Our delegation reaffirms its conviction that working methods are a fundamental component of the process of comprehensive Security Council reform. The implementation of the measures already agreed to improve its working methods and the adoption of new measures would lead to greater effectiveness in the work of the Council and thus to greater transparency and accountability. We believe that progress on working methods should not hinge on progress or success in other areas of reform. We are convinced that, through substantive reform of the working methods, we can help to remove the obstacles that occasionally impede the smooth running of the Security Council and its relations with other bodies.

The President: I now call on the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Argüello (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): We thank the delegation of Japan for having organized this open debate on working methods. Argentina has witnessed the constructive efforts pursued by Japan on this issue, having participated in 2006 in the drafting of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507, a legal instrument that has become the document of reference for this topic, filling, to some extent, the gap in the Security Council's rules of procedures.

The issue of the lack of transparency in the working methods of the Security Council is directly related to questions regarding the effectiveness and representativeness of the Council. In this regard, we believe that the valuable efforts deployed by Japan, Slovakia, Panama, Belgium, Viet Nam, Uganda and Costa Rica in recent years are valid and commendable, but we also believe that they are not enough. We still do not have measures that genuinely improve the transparency, participation and effectiveness of the work of the Council.

We believe it very important to pursue reform aimed at strengthening the institutional balance and relations between the Security Council and the other principal organs of the United Nations through regular official consultations, cooperation mechanisms and adequate exchange of information. In addition to enhancing cooperation between the Council and the General Assembly, regular and substantive dialogue should be established with the Economic and Social Council, reinforcing the communication provided for by Article 65 of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as with the Human Rights Council and the Peacebuilding Commission.

With regard to the accountability of the Security Council for its actions to the membership of the United Nations as a whole, a more detailed and analytical substantive annual report should be submitted to the General Assembly. The Council should also, whenever necessary or relevant, submit special reports to the General Assembly, pursuant to Articles 15 and 24 of the Charter.

Finally, we believe that there is a tendency to convene too many open thematic debates, which run the risk of becoming marathons of speeches without specific, clear and effective results. As I already noted, we recognize the progress that has been made in several areas, such as the monthly programme of work, the monthly briefings and assessments by the President, the clear improvement of the annual report to the General Assembly, and relations with troop-contributing countries.

In closing, we note our recognition of the substantial and very useful nature of the latest report on working methods produced by the organization *Security Council Report*.

The President: I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Benítez-Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba welcomes the convening of this important debate on a topic of interest to us all. We should also like to express our full support for the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The position of Cuba is clear. The Security Council needs to undergo comprehensive, urgent and far-reaching reform. There can be no genuine reform of the United Nations until the Security Council is reformed.

Security Council reform must by necessity include the modification of its working methods. In recent years, there have been modest changes in the working methods of the Council, including on some of the issues raised in the note contained in document S/2006/507 and subsequent notes by the President of the Council. But the majority of the changes have been somewhat formal and, in reality, the Council is neither transparent, democratic nor efficient.

Unfortunately, the permanent members — and on occasion not even all of them — in particular when dealing with highly important issues, continue to negotiate behind closed doors, where they take decisions of fundamental importance that are later presented as faits accompli to the other members of the Council and the rest of the membership of the United Nations.

Cuba believes that, as a minimum, the following urgent changes, to mention but a few, are necessary to the working methods of the Council.

The number of public meetings should be increased, in accordance with Article 31 and 32 of the Charter of the United Nations. Closed meetings and unofficial consultations should take place only in very exceptional circumstances. The State concerned should be allowed to participate in Council discussions on topics that affect it directly, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter. The opinions expressed by Member States in thematic open debates should be reflected in the resolutions and presidential statements of the Council. Those countries that are not members of the Council should be guaranteed access to subsidiary bodies and the right to participate in their discussions. The Council's rules of procedure, which remain provisional after more 60 years, should be formalized in order to increase transparency and accountability.

Cuba notes with serious concern the growing tendency of the Council to consider matters and assume functions that are not within its competence, usurping the role granted by the Charter to other bodies, in particular the General Assembly. This trend must be stopped as a matter of urgency. The Council needs, as soon as possible, to carry out a profound revision of its agenda and to bring it in line with its mandate. The Council should strictly observe the provisions of the Charter and all the resolutions of the General Assembly as the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the United Nations.

The Council must give due account of its work to the General Assembly by submitting truly analytical annual reports, as well as special reports as provided for under Articles 15 and 24 of the Charter of the United Nations. Such special reports, unfortunately, still do not exist.

The question of the veto is intrinsically linked to the working methods of the Council, especially its decision-making mechanism. The veto is an anachronistic and anti-democratic privilege that should be eliminated as soon as possible. Until that happens, it would be important as a first step to consider various options for limiting the use of the veto, such as limiting the use of the veto to votes on measures adopted by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter; allowing for the possible annulment of the veto through an affirmative vote by an agreed number of Council members in line with the number of members of an expanded Council; or allowing for a possible

annulment of the veto by a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly.

In conclusion, I stress our conviction that a more transparent Council would be a more legitimate Council. A more inclusive and accessible Council that truly takes into account the opinions of the Member States of the Organization would be a more effective Council. We already have a significant number of specific proposals to improve the Council's working methods, such as those presented by the Non-Aligned Movement. What we need now is to take action without further delay.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's debate on an issue to which we attach great importance. We thank the Japanese presidency for the concept paper (S/2010/165) and for its continued stewardship since 2009 of the Council's Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

The very fact that the Security Council is holding an open debate on the issue of its working methods is in and of itself of some significance. While we acknowledge the prerogative of the Council to set its own working methods, we have always argued that, since the Council acts on behalf of the United Nations membership, it is both natural and legitimate for the latter to discuss the Council's working methods.

India associates itself with the growing clamour for early reform of the working methods of the Council, which is an integral part of the broader imperative of the comprehensive reform and expansion of the membership of the Council in both the permanent and non-permanent categories. The overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations has already reiterated its support for such reforms.

The Council will render great service to the cause of maintaining international peace and security by deepening and enriching its consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries in the devising, revision and implementation of the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions. In addition, such constructive consultations can and will have a salutary impact on the ongoing efforts to enhance the transparency and effectiveness of the Council's work.

Another area that cries out for urgent reforms relates to the Council's annual report to the General Assembly. At present, the annual report continues to be a statistical compilation of events — a bland summary and listing of meetings and outcome documents. It is important that the General Assembly be aware not only of what decisions were taken, but also of the rationale, efficacy and impact of the Council's decisions in terms of crystallized take-aways for the membership of the General Assembly. Further, it is important for the Council to submit, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly, in accordance with Article 24 (3) of the Charter, for the consideration of the Assembly in accordance with Article 15 (1) of the Charter.

Apart from the specific areas of reform that I have already mentioned, my delegation believes that the Council should urgently undertake the following measures.

First, as a general rule, the Council must meet in meetings open to all United Nations Member States.

Secondly, it must implement Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter by consulting on a regular basis with non-members, especially those with a special interest in the substantive matter under consideration by the Council.

Thirdly, it must grant non-members access to its subsidiary organs, including the right to participate as appropriate.

Fourthly, it should make available to non-members draft resolutions and presidential statements, as well as other draft documents that are submitted at the Council's informal consultations of the whole for action on its agenda items, as soon as such documents are submitted or earlier, if so authorized by the author of the draft.

Fifthly, it must hold frequent, timely and substantive briefings for non-members on the matters discussed in the Council and its subsidiary organs, including briefings on its ad hoc missions, their terms of reference and the findings of such missions.

Sixthly, it should hold regular consultations with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

My delegation is supportive of the ongoing efforts, including and particularly those of the group of five small countries (S-5), to bring about improvements in the Council's working methods. Such efforts have succeeded in keeping the issue of working methods high on the reform agenda.

Yet we must acknowledge that real progress has been minimal, despite years of efforts. Some permanent members continue to argue that the reform of the working methods cannot be discussed by non-members. Even many of the decisions adopted by the Council in the note contained in document S/2006/507 remain unimplemented, and there appears to be little appetite for the far-reaching reforms that the large majority is demanding. This only strengthens our view that the many flaws in the Council's working methods are merely symptoms of a deeper malaise rooted in its structure and composition.

Clearly, genuine and lasting improvement of the working methods of the Council can be possible only as part of a comprehensive process of Security Council reform, based on both the reform and expansion of its composition in the permanent and non-permanent categories. Until there is a change in the real power structure of the Council — its permanent membership — we cannot realistically expect the deep-seated changes that the large majority seeks.

We invite the S-5 and others to work closely, actively and in lock-step with the wider international community seeking comprehensive reforms of the Council. In the absence of such comprehensive reform, a fundamental improvement in the working methods will either elude us, as it has for more than 60 years, or, even if miraculously achieved, would not last without the institutional memory, continuing commitment and peer example of new permanent members.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Vidal (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Greater transparency, efficiency and interaction with non-Council members are goals shared by all. We are aware of the commitment of the delegation of Japan to the permanent improvement of the Council's working methods, and we congratulate it on that initiative.

The review of the Security Council's working methods is a subject of great importance to Uruguay. We believe that Member States have the right to participate in the negotiation and decision-making processes of the Organization's organs, especially when they have a direct interest in the results of the deliberations and when those results affect their citizens or their highest objectives. A concrete example of this is the interaction between the Council and troop- and police-contributing countries in the context of decisions on peacekeeping operations.

It is fair to acknowledge here that, since the most recent open debate on this subject (see S/PV.5968), tangible and substantive progress has been achieved with regard to this legitimate demand by police- and troop-contributing countries. On the one hand, private meetings with troop- and police-contributing countries have been convened further in advance of mandate renewals. At least in principle, that gives the Council time to consider the inputs of those countries. We hope that this practice will continue and that the implementation of resolution 1353 (2001) will be stepped up.

On the other hand, we highlight the reactivation, in 2009, of the informal consultation mechanism involving the members of the Security Council, troop and police contributors and the Secretariat in the context of the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations. We believe that the exchanges at various meetings on significant challenges to specific missions have been very useful and productive. We hope that the Working Group will relaunch such meetings with troop and police contributors as soon as possible. We also hope that it will be possible to debate cross-cutting issues that have been identified as relevant to the entire peacekeeping system. We also hope that such meetings will be made part of the institutional framework, rather than being left up to the presence or absence of a given country in the Security Council.

On another front, we express our general concern about the link that has been established between the issue we are debating today and the reform of the composition of the Council, as if they were inextricably linked. As we have said on other occasions, these are two inexplicably linked issues that cannot serve as a mutual basis for negotiation. Some time ago, the group of five small countries (S-5) submitted to the General Assembly draft resolution A/60/L.49, which contained worthwhile suggestions and proposals that could be adopted today itself by the

vast majority of Members. The way in which that valuable proposal was received was not especially productive. The fact is that the working methods of the Security Council have been held hostage to the Council's enlargement, which is an extremely difficult issue.

Uruguay supports draft resolution A/60/L.49 submitted by the S-5, as well as similar documents put forward in connection with it. In the context of that proposal, we are prepared to consider a package that moves us towards the single undertaking referred to by some States. However, we reiterate that we believe that the Council's working methods and expansion are two separate issues that can be resolved on different tracks.

Let us rekindle the spirit of draft resolution A/60/L.49 and of the worthwhile efforts of the S-5. Let us now propose a set of measures that will make it possible to improve the Council's working methods. Let us make it possible to realize those valuable proposals on which almost all of us agree.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Malta.

Mr. Borg (Malta): My delegation would like to join other delegations in expressing appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Security Council for giving us this opportunity to participate in this interesting open debate on the implementation of the measures set out in the note contained in document S/2006/507, concerning the working methods of the Security Council. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you, Sir, for your concept paper (S/2010/165), which is making a valuable contribution to this debate.

Improving the transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of the working methods of the Security Council must continue to serve as a pillar of Council reform, which also continues to be the subject of debate in the context of the five inextricably linked key issues within the framework of the intergovernmental negotiations. Increased transparency in the working methods of the Security Council would increase not only the credibility and legitimacy of the Council, but also its accountability, in particular at a time when the effectiveness of the Council is continually being tested. In that regard, Malta welcomes the measures taken recently by the Security Council to improve those three dimensions of a progressive and open Security Council.

While much more has to be done to reach an optimal level of transparency, Malta believes that the monthly briefings by incoming Council Presidents on the programme of work and the increase in detail contained in the annual report of the Security Council that is presented to the General Assembly have enhanced the relationship between the members of the Council and the wider membership of the United Nations. We also welcome the missions to the field undertaken by Security Council members, thereby bringing the work of the Council closer to Governments and peoples.

It is an acknowledged fact that the adoption of improved working methods depends in principle on the members of the Security Council themselves. However, we believe that the views of the general membership of the United Nations should continue to receive positive consideration by the Security Council membership, including through the holding of open debates and briefings and fewer closed meetings. That would in turn enhance access to and participation in the work of the Council for all members, especially small States.

There is a false perception that many issues before the Security Council are the exclusive responsibility of its members, and in particular of permanent members. However, that perception is fading with time owing to the growing recognition that current threats are becoming increasingly global and transnational in nature. No boundaries exist for such threats. The matters that are brought to the attention of the Council are therefore issues that call for the greater involvement of and engagement by and with non-members or the Council.

My delegation acknowledges that some progress has been made with regard to regular consultations between the Council and the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Chairs of the Commission's country-specific configurations. In welcoming such an improvement, we feel that the Security Council needs to make more space for the Peacebuilding Commission in order to allow it to further secure its place within United Nations structures.

As a small State, Malta believes that an improved and enhanced working relationship between the Security Council and the other principal organs, in particular the General Assembly, through regular and institutionalized consultations should be a matter for

further consideration by the Council. The ongoing dialogue between the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council is commendable and should be further encouraged.

The number of challenges facing the Council is on the increase, thereby placing additional burdens on the workload and efficiency of the Council. In that context, consideration must be given to making existing United Nations technical information and information-gathering capabilities more effective through the use of information technology. Such information — including prompt, relevant and current information on matters with which the Council is seized — should be made accessible not only to the members of the Security Council, but also to the membership of the United Nations a whole. That would enable all Member States to better assess conflicts and disputes that require an urgent, if not immediate, response by all countries concerned. That would be especially helpful in assisting the members of the Council to take timely and appropriate action to prevent the aggravation of particular situations or disputes.

The working methods by which the Council operates are crucial to the way the Council is held accountable for the maintenance of international peace and security. While noting the valid contribution being made by the group of five small countries, Malta encourages Council members to continue to explore ways on how to improve the working methods of the Security Council by ensuring enhanced transparency, effectiveness and interaction with non-members of the Council.

It is important that all Member States not only feel that they own the United Nations reform process, including that of the Security Council, but also that they continue to assume the guardianship of our Organization, of which the Security Council is a principal organ.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Khazaee (Islamic Republic of Iran): Let me express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, for convening this important meeting and for distributing the concept paper (S/2010/165) to facilitate the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507 on the working methods of the Security Council. While associating my delegation with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, delivered by the representative of Egypt, let me also share and emphasize the following points.

As is correctly stated in the concept paper annexed to the letter contained in document S/2010/165, the lack of improvement in the three interlinked and key issue areas of transparency, interaction with non-members and efficiency in the working methods of the Security Council is at the core of today's discussion. I wish to build on those shortcomings by further elaborating, as follows.

First, according to Article 24 of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council should act on behalf of all United Nations Member States. However, in reality, the Council's decisions not only decreasingly reflect the wish and the views of the general membership, but also, in many cases, do not even represent the genuine opinion of its own general membership.

Secondly, despite the requirement of the Council's own decisions on its working methods, including those contained in document S/2006/507, which, for instance, call for consultation by the Council with:

> "the broader United Nations membership, in particular interested Member States, including countries directly involved or specifically affected, ... when drafting, inter alia, resolutions, presidential statements and press statements," *(S/2006/507, section VII, para. 42)*

in many cases the general membership and even the countries concerned are kept totally uninformed of the negotiations on resolutions or statements directly affecting them, let alone their views on the Council's outcome documents being sought. That is also the case for non-permanent members when they are frequently faced with the situation of secretive negotiations being held among a few permanent members on important issues.

Thirdly, the refusal to allow non-members of the Council to participate in discussions on matters affecting them and their interests, and the denial to the countries concerned of the right to brief the Council on their positions on issues having a direct effect on their national interests, and, more crucially, of their right of reply to countries against which allegations are raised

during certain formats of the Council's meetings are in total disregard of Article 31 of the Charter.

A fourth shortcoming is the ongoing trend of selective notification of Council meetings and the failure to convene regular and necessary briefings.

Fifthly, the quick and unnecessary resort to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and the threat or use of sanctions in cases where no action has been necessary are other disturbing facts that have undermined the credibility and legitimacy of the Council's decisions.

Sixthly, as has been mentioned by various delegations on different occasions, the veto power has always raised concerns and criticism on various grounds among a significant majority of Member States. There is a strong sense of injustice and discrimination between the haves and the have-nots. In fact, the veto is a non-constructive instrument that undermines the possibility of action by the Council in many cases where it is needed.

To increase the transparency of its work, to strike a balanced approach in interaction with non-members, and to improve the efficiency of its working methods, the Council should seriously address the said shortcomings and take into consideration the relevant provisions of the Charter and of the resolutions that clarify its relationship with the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations.

Finally and undoubtedly, impartiality, transparency and fairness are key premises on which the Security Council should base its approach to discharging its responsibilities mandated by the Charter. Every effort should be made to render the Council more democratic, representative and accountable. My delegation stands ready to contribute to the achievement of those goals.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Singapore.

Mr. Menon (Singapore): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on the implementation of the note contained in document S/2006/507 on the Security Council's working methods. Member States last had the opportunity to express their views on this important topic in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968).

Singapore fully subscribes to the statement delivered by the representative of Liechtenstein on behalf of the group of five small countries, of which we are a member.

Among the areas of Security Council reform, we believe that the issue of working methods is one that commands widespread support and resonance with Member States. It is also an area that is objectively logical to develop, but has been practically mired in the reluctance of the Council to open itself up to scrutiny by fellow Member States.

The provisional rules of procedure of the Council state that meetings shall be held in public. Unfortunately, that premise of transparency has been eroded over the years in favour of so-called effectiveness and functionality. It is supposed to be easier to broker deals to save the world in back rooms than in boardrooms. Yet, it strains the bounds of credulity for Member States to hear each year, in the face of constant threats to regional peace and human dignity, that the Council has discharged its responsibility for maintaining peace and security. It is absolutely true that the Council has to manage serious global complexities with less than adequate resources, but it is also true that the Council is sometimes prey to its own practices, which add to the complexities rather than solve them.

Thus, it was significant that the Council adopted note S/2006/507, signalling recognition of the need to improve how it functioned. That document contains many measures to address the three areas identified by the President for possible discussion during this open debate, namely, transparency, interaction and dialogue with non-members, and efficiency. In practice, however, the implementation of the document's contents has been uneven.

Transparency is one area of great interest to Singapore, as it promotes a sense of accountability in the Organization. However, we should not mislead ourselves into believing that reports and briefings alone can ensure greater transparency. The notion of openness extends to developments as simple as an explanation for the sudden shift in the date of this open debate or the provision of adequate notification of important meetings of the Council.

It should also extend to the access that non-members, the Secretariat and even members of the press have to Security Council members and, where

relevant, their deliberations. In that connection, there has been some concern over the perceived curtailing of such access, ostensibly due to the limitations imposed by the relocation of the Security Council Chamber as part of the Capital Master Plan. That is an issue of transparency and needs to be addressed.

We acknowledge that there has been some improvement in the opportunities for interaction and dialogue between the Council and non-Council members. That includes interactions with troop- and police-contributing countries, as well as regional organizations, consultations between the Security Council and Member States in the preparation of the annual report, and briefings by Security Council presidents on each month's programme of work.

However, much more could be done, particularly on issues of interest and concern to Member States. For example, countries directly affected by a particular issue being considered by the Security Council should be given every opportunity to participate in the deliberations. Beyond interaction and dialogue, the Council should also not fear opening up its proceedings to non-members. Ultimately, it is in the interest of the Council to create a climate of trust, which is possible only if Member States are better able to appreciate and understand the decision-making considerations, processes of and challenges faced by the Council.

The Council's scorecard on efficiency is middling. The Security Council, in document S/2006/507, undertook to maintain regular communication with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council for better coordination among the principal organs of the United Nations. However, its implementation has been cursory when it could easily be a catalyst to streamline processes within the Organization and demonstrate the Council's commitment to promoting greater efficiency within the United Nations system. As a simple example, when the Security Council decides to establish a special political mission, it makes sense to ensure that the Fifth Committee is notified without delay and provided with as comprehensive a picture as possible, enabling it to factor such information into its consideration of the overall resource requirements necessary for such missions.

Without this basic coordination, unnecessary complications can arise and precious resources wasted. In December 2009, the Council took decisions on three special political missions. At the same time, the Fifth Committee had been considering the budget for such missions for the coming biennium 2010-2011. Even though the Council's decisions had been taken before the Fifth Committee concluded its work for the main session, information on the three special political missions that would have affected the outcome of the Committee's deliberations was not forthcoming.

While the appropriate course of action is for the Fifth Committee to be notified through a report of the Secretary-General, accompanied by recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, this process takes time. As a result, the resource requirements for these three missions had to be taken up separately when the Fifth Committee resumed its work in March 2010. This led to difficult negotiations, as some countries were resistant to the idea of increasing the overall budget for special political missions to accommodate these additional resource requirements, while others were concerned that absorbing this cost under the overall budget for such missions would negatively impact existing missions. While a solution was eventually found, many of the complications could have been avoided if a system had been in place to better facilitate the flow of information between the Security Council and the Fifth Committee from the inception of these special political missions. It is incumbent upon Member States to see what we can do to improve such working methods and thereby enhance the efficiencies of both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Singapore appreciates the opportunity of this open debate. We are encouraged by the Security Council's willingness to continue its engagement on this issue and its efforts to better implement the contents of document S/2006/507. We look forward to continuing our discussions with the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions later this year, and to further open debates.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Sergeyev (Ukraine): I would like to thank you, Sir, for holding this important meeting and congratulate you on a successful presidency. We broadly share the priorities for today's debate arising from the concept paper (S/2010/165), namely,

transparency, interaction with members at large and the efficiency of the Council. Japan's valuable contribution to reinforcing these three pillars is well known and much appreciated.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the Council, coupled with its openness and transparency, were the guidelines of Ukraine's first and so far only Council tenure as an independent State in 2000 and 2001. One of the main lessons we learned was that greater transparency and interaction with the general membership are essential to the support of the Council's decisions and their implementation in the most critical areas, such as peacekeeping, counter-terrorism, sanctions and others.

We welcome the number of new positive developments thereafter, including the 2006 presidential note under discussion today (S/2006/507). One of these relates to the strengthening of the thematic edge of the Council's agenda. It bodes well for the United Nations relevance that such pressing issues as maritime piracy, the protection of civilians, post-conflict peacebuilding, drug and arms trafficking and other challenges have been featured more and more prominently among the Council's activities.

Against this backdrop and with due consideration for the primary responsibility of the Council in the maintenance of interventional peace and security, we would like such major topics as conflict prevention to be more visible on the Council's radar. The sheer complexity of this issue should not discourage the Council from digging deeper into the richness of preventive diplomacy. There are far too many crises in which no timely alarm goes off before their eruption.

The way the Council interacts with the troop- and police-contributing countries is of great importance to Ukraine. We take positive note of some welcome changes in this area thanks to collective and individual efforts within the Council. The collective input, channelled through the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations established in 2001 with the active support of Ukraine, proved to be particularly instrumental. Private consultations with troop-contributing countries well in advance of Council meetings on relevant missions, such as those held this month, are among the features that have to become customary.

Yet there is room for further progress in the Council's techniques in the area of peacekeeping, especially in giving troop-contributing countries a stronger voice in the decision-making process. In our view, more regular consultations between the Working Group and the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations would serve that purpose. The choice of the Working Group to close capability gaps as one of its priorities for this year is quite fitting for such cooperation.

Ukraine welcomes improvements in the Council's handling of sanctions regimes by ensuring their targeted and, where possible, time-bound character, spelling out concrete conditions for lifting, improving listing and de-listing, and providing for periodic assessment. We encourage the Council's members to further refine its methodology in this sphere.

We know, including from our own experience in the Council, that much of what has been achieved by this body can be attributed to the contribution of its rotating members. They enter the Council with innovative ideas, creative energy and an appetite for making a mark on its work. That is why we believe that the Council should look further into the most effective ways of channelling and maximizing the profit from this contribution. The need for more insight into the Council's affairs is widely recognized by non-members. In this regard, one could make a practical suggestion for formalizing the currently ad hoc yet valuable practice of holding regular briefings for the regional groups by the non-permanent members they delegated to the Council. In the same vein, we see merit in giving due consideration to the idea of revisiting the practice of interactive end-of-presidency wrap-up meetings. In our view, members and non-members of the Council alike would equally benefit from this.

Ukraine encourages the Council to maintain and build on the positive dynamic in streamlining its modus operandi, while becoming more open and transparent. In this regard, we believe that some recent changes in terms of access to the Council are of a technical and temporary nature.

We look forward to the revised version of the 2006 presidential note and to continuing today's discussion in a more systematic manner. Ukraine remains fully committed to a strong, effective, efficient and transparent Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Ney (Germany): Let me express my gratitude to you, Sir, for having prepared and convened this very useful debate. Your concept paper (S/2010/165) provides a helpful summary of what has been achieved since the Council's last debate on the issue (see S/PV.5968) and where there is still room for improvement. I would also like to thank the group of five small countries — Costa Rica, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Singapore and Switzerland — for their valuable ideas on and unwavering commitment to this significant issue.

The three issues highlighted in the concept paper — transparency, interaction and efficiency — rightfully continue to occupy centre stage in this debate. Let me address transparency first.

With the increased involvement of the United Nations in conflict resolution around the world in recent years, the role of the Security Council has become ever more prominent. This heightened level of activity has been accompanied by a growing interest of the general membership in the Council's proceedings. Thus, now more than ever, transparency is of paramount importance if the Council is to meet expectations. While we welcome progress in this regard, transparency could be enhanced by further moving the consultative process into the open. There is little rationale for having routine meetings take place behind closed doors. Also, Council documents such as reports, statements and draft resolutions, as well as briefing notes, should be made available to non-members in a timely fashion.

With regard to enhanced interaction with the general membership, we strongly support the notion that access to the Council by affected parties should be facilitated. This should include, first and foremost, Member States that have a vested interest in the item under discussion, such as countries contributing troops or police to a peacekeeping operation. This should also include increased cooperation with the main financial contributors. It is certainly fruitful to also consider enhanced interaction with stakeholders outside the United Nations membership, such as non-governmental organizations or non-State actors, that play a crucial role in solving a specific conflict. These forms of interaction could provide the Council with an even better basis for its decisions and ultimately make it more effective. In this regard, we welcome the use of new formats such as informal interactive dialogue.

Let me add that interaction should also be strengthened with other institutions within the United Nations, for example the Peacebuilding Commission. The Security Council needs to consider ways to maximize the use of the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role, particularly with regard to early peacebuilding activities carried out by peacekeepers. To that end, we need a stronger, organic and more dynamic linkage between the Council and the Commission throughout the various stages of the Council's consideration of a specific conflict.

The fact that the Security Council is today holding its third open debate on this subject under Japan's tenure is in itself an expression of the welcome attention this body is paying to improving the interaction with non-members of the Council. The long list of speakers for this meeting in turn demonstrates the great interest of the general membership in further pursuing this path.

Of course, increased access for non-members must not undermine efforts to make the work of the Council more efficient. We are convinced, however, that transparency, interaction and efficiency can be enhanced hand in hand. Let me assure members that Germany, as a candidate for a non-permanent seat on the Council for 2011-2012, remains deeply committed to the aim of improving the Council's working methods and that this commitment will continue should we take a seat at this table.

While efforts to further improve the working methods of the Council remain necessary, we must not lose sight of the one big step this Organization has yet to take: a comprehensive reform of the Security Council that will make this body more legitimate, more representative and thus more effective. The question of its working methods cannot and must not be de-linked from the overall reform debate, as improving working methods alone will not bring about the change desired by the general membership.

We must address the fundamental issue: the necessity of bringing the Council into line with the geopolitical realities of today's world. We must address the untenable underrepresentation of Africa, Latin America and Asia, as well as the need to ensure adequate representation of other major contributors to the maintenance of peace and security. To improve working methods without reforming Security Council structures would ultimately create a source of political

frustration among the general membership and risk eroding the authority of the Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Colombia.

Ms. Blum (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes the convening of this debate on a matter of special importance to our Organization, in particular in the context of the ongoing process of Security Council reform. The note by the President of the Security Council contained in document S/2006/507 contains guidelines that deserve careful consideration with a view to enhancing the Council's transparency and effectiveness. Colombia welcomes the efforts made by the members of this organ to implement the practices outlined in that document.

We highlight the interaction by countries holding the Council presidency with Member States and the briefings given at the beginning of each month. Equally useful are the exchanges held by the Permanent Representative of the country in the presidency with media representatives and the webcasts of those exchanges.

Nevertheless, these practices must continue to be expanded in order further improve transparency and the participation of the membership in the Council's activities and decision-making. Efforts should be made to reduce the number of closed meetings that limit access by Member States and to guarantee the participation of States non-members of the Council in the discussion of matters that affect them directly. Moreover, it would be important to create greater opportunities for consultation with regional groups and organizations as well as with other actors, as necessary, to gain a greater understanding of the specific characteristics of each situation.

Advance circulation of or access to draft resolutions would be another step towards greater transparency in the work and decision-making of the Council. Member States should be fully informed about decisions the Council intends to make before they are finalized. A predictable and transparent decision-making process is necessary to strengthen the legitimacy of the Council's actions. To that end, efforts must be made to establish formal rules of procedure.

We recognize the efforts of the permanent members to limit the use of the veto, but we consider that regulating its use under clear parameters would be an important step towards greater transparency in the work of this organ. One could seek to limit the use of the veto to situations under Chapter VII of the Charter and only in situations calling for the use of force or the imposition of sanctions. That would be in accordance with the Council's mandate to guarantee the maintenance of international peace and security.

In a similar vein, the use of the veto could be limited to substantive, not procedural, matters, and consideration could be given to increasing the number of negative votes required by permanent Council members. For example, the veto might come into play only with the negative votes of at least two of those members.

In a broader sense, the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly is another element of particular relevance to this debate. There is a significant imbalance in that relationship. This is explained to a great extent by the Council's appropriation of General Assembly matters. According to the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly is the principal deliberative, policymaking and participatory body. Its mandate is comprehensive and includes matters related to disarmament and the maintenance of peace and security, as well the consideration of matters related to human rights and humanitarian law.

While the Council's working methods and its relations with the General Assembly have improved, there is still room for improvement, including periodic meetings among the Presidents of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council and the submission of regular analytical reports by the Council to the Assembly.

To conclude, allow me to emphasize that for my delegation modifying the working methods of the Security Council is an important part of the comprehensive Security Council reform process. We will therefore support all efforts and initiatives aimed at making the Council an organ that is more democratic and representative and more transparent and effective.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Kenya.

Mr. Muita (Kenya): Mr. President, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to contribute to this important debate. I wish at the outset to associate myself with the statements made by the representative

of Sierra Leone, who spoke on behalf of the African Group, and by the Permanent Representative of Egypt, who spoke on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Since the World Summit of 2005, momentum has been building on the question of Security Council reform. Member States have shown keen interest in the process of reform, as is evidenced by their robust engagement throughout the past year.

My delegation considers the subject of the Security Council's working methods to be an extremely important part of the wider debate on Security Council reform. Indeed, we understand the reform of the working methods to be an integral part of the comprehensive discussions that we have been holding during the course of the past year. We look forward to actively participating in the forthcoming round of intergovernmental negotiations.

In July 2006, the Security Council adopted the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507, which seeks to improve the working methods of the Council. We acknowledge that the adoption of the note was a significant step forward aimed at advancing the call for meaningful reform of the Council's working methods. That having been said, we, like many others, are of the view that further measures, coupled with the continued and systematic implementation of note S/2006/507, are necessary to achieve credible reforms. In that regard, my delegation urges the Council to revisit the note, take stock of the measures that the Council has taken decisions on and subsequently address the shortcomings in their implementation.

In a continuing bid to improve the Council's working methods, my delegation supports the idea of the Council going a step further in such reform. In that respect, it is important that the implementation of the measures contained in note S/2006/507 be consistent and predictable, rather than ad hoc.

The Council should also strive to improve perceptions of accountability by improving its reporting mechanism to the General Assembly. The discussion of the annual Security Council report to the Assembly should be conducted in an environment of frankness and openness, which in turn allows for a genuine exchange of views between the general membership and the Council. The Council should also improve its working methods by submitting special reports to the General Assembly apart from its annual report, as stipulated under paragraph 3 of Article 24 of the United Nations Charter.

As a troop-contributing country (TCC), Kenya appreciates the recent efforts that the Council has undertaken to improve interaction with TCCs. Strengthening cooperation between the Council, the Secretariat and TCCs enhances the possibility for success in peacekeeping operations. The importance of the mutual undertaking between those who mandate peacekeeping operations, those who plan and manage them and those who implement the mandates cannot be overemphasized. My delegation therefore welcomed the presidential statement of August 2009 (S/PRST/2009/24) that advocated for the forging of stronger and more transparent cooperation between the United Nations and TCCs through transparent consultations at all stages of peacekeeping operations.

As for the improvement of working methods, Kenya also suggests the following measures. The Security Council should finalize its provisional rules of procedure, including new methods of work and practices that have already been agreed upon. The Council should hold open public meetings at all stages of the consideration of a subject. The Council should endeavour to keep written records of formal meetings of the Council for future reference. Non-members of the Security Council should be accorded more and more regular access to the work of the Council. The Council should enhance measures to guarantee transparency in decision-making, especially in developing fairer procedures for sanctions regimes. Regular and frequent consultations and exchanges of views with other major organs of the United Nations, especially the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, should be scheduled. Briefings by the President of the Council to the General Assembly should be regular, substantive and conducted promptly after each informal consultation of the whole. Lastly, members of the Security Council should be encouraged to take a transparent approach in dealing with non-members of the Council with respect to the Council's work, with a view to deriving benefit from different perspectives on a given subject.

Kenya reiterates that the democratization of the United Nations can only occur if there is a holistic and realistic reform of the Council that will make it more transparent, accountable and legitimate. One way of achieving that is by improving the working methods of the Council and its relationship with the General

Assembly through genuine cooperation and coordination between the two organs.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me assure you of my delegation's continued engagement in the process of reforming the Security Council with a view to achieving the objectives set forth in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (A/60/RES/1). I would also like to thank the delegation of Japan for organizing this debate.

The President: I now give the floor to the Permanent Representative of Namibia.

Mr. Mbuende (Namibia): Mr. President, at the outset, I thank you for convening this debate on the working methods of the Security Council as set out in the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507.

Namibia fully aligns itself with the statement delivered by the Deputy Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group. We also fully support the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

At the 2005 World Summit, world leaders agreed that the Security Council needed to adapt its working methods so as to increase the involvement of States that are not members of the Council in its work, enhance its accountability to the membership and increase the transparency of its work.

It therefore cannot be business as usual. The Security Council has to change the way in which it conducts its business and interacts with the General Assembly and the wider United Nations membership. We note that some aspects of the Council's working methods have evolved, but that evolution has tended to be ad hoc and often is not reflected in any formal decision of the Security Council. Some of the changes in the working methods have been captured in the notes of successive Presidents of the Security Council. However, often, the language is drafted in aspirational terms rather than as firm commitments.

To the best of our knowledge, there has never been any change in the provisional status of the rules of procedures of the Security Council. It is regrettable that the rules of procedure have continued almost unchanged since their adoption, in 1946. In the view of my delegation, it is time for the rules of procedure of the Council to be formalized. We believe it to be in the interest of the Organization that this step be taken. We therefore urge Member States, especially the permanent members of the Security Council, to replace the provisional rules of procedure of the Council with standing rules of procedure. In our view, that would greatly enhance the transparency of the work of the Council.

Article 31 of the United Nations Charter provides that any Member of the United Nations that is not a member of the Security Council may participate in the discussion of any question brought before the Council whenever the interests of that Member State are specially affected. Quite often, the Security Council discusses issues without giving Member States with an interest in those issues an opportunity to participate in any meaningful way. Namibia shares the concern expressed by many delegations that this practice is contrary to the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Similarly, we have noted that, at times, elected members of the Council experience difficulties in participating effectively, particularly when draft resolutions have been negotiated behind the scenes among the five permanent members. While recognizing the need for the Council to adopt its decisions expeditiously, sufficient time should be allotted for all members of the Council to be consulted as well as for their consideration of drafts prior to any action by the Security Council on specific items.

The majority of military personnel participating in United Nations peacekeeping missions come from countries not represented on the Council. At the same time, the nature of peacekeeping operations has become substantially more risky and complex than that of the traditional peacekeeping operations of the past. Namibia would like to see further improvement in the interaction between the Council and troop-contributing countries.

Finally, the report of the Security Council to the General Assembly, which, under paragraph 3 of Article 24 of the Charter, must be submitted annually, is the most visible source of information about the work of the Council. It is therefore important that the report be analytical, providing not only an account of the matters considered by the Council in the year under review, but also an assessment of the Council's ability to deal with the problems at hand and signalling difficulties and areas where improvements could be

made. In addition, the report should continue to include an account of the work of the Military Staff Committee and of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Czech Republic.

Mr. Kaiser (Czech Republic): First of all, I would like to thank the delegation of Japan for organizing this open debate on the implementation of the presidential note contained in document S/2006/507. We believe — and today's debate confirms our conviction — that the topic of the improvement of the working methods of the Security Council is a very important one. We acknowledge and appreciate the long-standing commitment of Japan in this regard, especially its stewardship of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

The Czech Republic fully recognizes the primary responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, as stipulated in the Charter. This role requires the Council to be action-oriented and efficient in its proceedings. However, this goal cannot and should not be achieved at the expense of transparency. The key United Nations organ should be accountable to the broader membership and the whole United Nations system; that is the only way to maintain and enhance its legitimacy when acting on behalf of us all.

The Czech Republic recognizes that the Council has already undertaken a number of important initiatives, including those referred to in the presidential note. At the same time, we are of the opinion that further steps are required in order to build trust among the Member States and create a sense of ownership of the Council's decisions, which they are all are obliged to implement.

We have studied with great interest the concept paper prepared by the Japanese presidency (S/2010/165), and we agree with its outline of the main topics: transparency, interaction of the Council with non-members and, last but not least, efficiency.

I will turn now to the issues of transparency and access. In our view, more transparency can be achieved by advancing prompt information-sharing and better access. All Member States should receive as much information as possible about the current deliberations of the Council and its subsidiary bodies. We welcome the practice of briefings by new Council Presidents, as well as greater coverage of the subsidiary bodies and all the improvements in reporting to non-members in general. Nevertheless, such reporting should be more substantial and analytical. This applies primarily but not exclusively to the annual report to the General Assembly. In this context, let me express appreciation for the recent increase in open debates of the Security Council. We welcome this progress and believe that it should be further developed.

The Czech Republic would also like to welcome the adoption of resolution 1904 (2009), improving the transparency of the listing and de-listing procedures in the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). We hope that the newly adopted measure — the establishment of the ombudsperson — will be fully explored in order to ensure the due process rights of concerned individuals and entities, including petitioners filing de-listing requests.

I would like now to say a few words on the other two issues mentioned in the concept paper, namely, interaction and effectiveness. There is no doubt that interaction with the parties that have direct interest in an issue on the table of the Security Council is of crucial importance. We appreciate the efforts made so far in this regard, but there is still room for improvement. This applies also to the relations between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries. Despite recent important initiatives, much remains to be done in engaging the troop-contributing countries in the whole decision-making process concerning peacekeeping operations, from the initial phases of shaping their mandates to their deployment and management.

Regarding a more general problem of dialogue between the Council and affected or otherwise interested non-member States, we believe that we can more benefit from such measures as ad hoc consultations or Arria Formula meetings.

In the presidential note, the Security Council expresses its intention to maintain regular communication with other principal organs of the United Nations. It is our conviction that enhancement of the working relations between the Security Council, on the one hand, and the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), on the other, is a precondition for making the whole United Nations system more

efficient. We therefore share the opinion expressed by a number of speakers today that we should further strengthen the relations between the Council and the PBC. We believe that the PBC and its country-specific configurations can contribute substantially to the work of the Council, specifically on issues relating to peacekeeping and early peacebuilding.

We believe that it is hardly possible to overestimate the importance of the interaction of the Council with regional organizations.

We are convinced that the measures aimed at increasing transparency and improving interaction should not be detrimental to the effectiveness of the Council. On the contrary, they could form the basis for a better response and a more effective decision-making process based on better knowledge of the actual challenges that the Member States are facing. At the same time, we would like to stress that all efforts aimed at improving the working methods of the Security Council are extremely important, but that they are just part of a more complex task, which is the adaptation of the Council to the realities of today's world. In other words, the improvement of the working methods will bring about meaningful difference only if the Council itself is reformed to be more representative and legitimate.

Finally, let me assure you, Mr. President, of the readiness of the Czech Republic to work with the Council and all the Member States in further improving the working methods of this key body of the United Nations system.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Mr. Escalona Ojeda (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela): On behalf of the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, I would like to thank the Permanent Representative of Japan who is presiding over the Security Council in the month of April. We also welcome the initiative of convening this open debate to consider the implementation of the measures described in the presidential note on the working methods of this Council (S/2006/507).

Our delegation associates itself with the statement made on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement by the representative of Egypt.

The review of the Council's working methods is a subject of special interest to our Government. This issue, linked to the wider sphere of the reform of this organ, is key to the full exercise of the sovereign equality of nations and to the legitimacy of the United Nations as a promoter and guarantor of international peace and justice.

The most recent rounds of intergovernmental negotiations on this subject showed that most Member States agree on the need to make the Security Council more transparent and accountable. There have also been repeated calls to reverse the Council's tendency to take control of issues that have been the exclusive responsibility of the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly; to take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly on questions relating to international peace and security; and to improve the Council's accountability to the General Assembly by submitting substantive and analytical reports to it.

Venezuela has joined in these calls and hereby reaffirms its support for those proposals. In that regard, the definitive approval of Security Council rules of procedure is a crucial step to establish the explicit procedures necessary for the Council to comply with its obligations to the General Assembly under the provisions of the Charter.

We here to stress the need to guarantee that non-members of the Council enjoy early and timely access to all resolutions and statements of this organ, as well as the importance of promoting the access and participation of non-permanent members in all its deliberations and consultations. We are certain that the consideration of different perspectives will make the Council's work more efficient because it will ensure a more all-encompassing and balanced treatment of issues within its authority, effectively and fairly reflecting the interests and needs of countries of the North and the South. However, this aspiration can become reality only if the closed meetings and briefings of the Security Council are limited and the number of open sessions is increased.

To conclude, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to recall that, as the representative of Egypt stated, any effort to improve the working methods of the Security Council will require significant political resolve within the Council itself and the implementation of the diverse and constructive proposals made by Member States to

make the workings of this organ more transparent and more legitimate.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Zainal Abidin (Malaysia): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and for your concept paper (S/2010/165). My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The concept paper that we have before us all too quickly assumes that the aim of prompt and effective action is inherently incompatible with that of gaining the support of the wider United Nations membership. By contrast, Malaysia firmly believes that in many situations, effective action requires the support of the entire international community. By the same token, Malaysia firmly believes that the principles of transparency, interaction and dialogue with non-members, as well as efficiency, must be applied to the entire spectrum of the Council's work, including in the implementation of its resolutions.

Malaysia notes that some measures contained in document S/2006/507 to enhance the efficiency and transparency of the Council's work have been implemented. However, as this exercise has yet to be completed, regular interactions such as today's meeting will provide the necessary impetus for their implementation.

Some of the measures contained in document S/2006/507 — such as referring to all speakers at political and ambassadorial level by name and title and ensuring that draft documents be made available to non-Council members when these documents are introduced within informal consultations — lend themselves to quick implementation; others less so. Those include such measures as having subsidiary bodies of the Council seek the views of Member States and having sanctions committees seek the views of those States affected by sanctions, which have either not been put in place or have been done sporadically and sparingly. This statement is focused on those measures.

In cases where sanctions committees meet to discuss the requests of States to de-list entities or individuals from consolidated lists, that particular State should have the opportunity to either listen in on the proceedings of the Committee or be officially informed of the proceedings in which their requests were considered. This would enable the State concerned to better understand why certain de-listings took place, while others did not.

Further, we believe that the briefings given by the special representatives or heads of United Nations missions or by the Secretariat to the Council are inherently useful because they provide an account of what is actually happening on the ground.

We advocate, therefore, greater transparency in the briefings made to the Security Council and for non-Council members to be allowed to hold watching briefs without the right to interject or interact. This would not only generate greater interest in these issues among the entire membership, but would also afford non-members of the Council the chance to understand subjects and viewpoints of the Council.

Finally, we would like to touch on the thematic debates that now form the norm in the Council's monthly programme of work. Malaysia appreciates the fact that regional and subregional organizations are also invited to speak and participate in open thematic debates, particularly when such debates are relevant to a given organization. Further, we hope that the new trend of increased interaction with troop-contributing countries will be further expanded, given the indispensable role that those countries play in the maintenance of peace and security worldwide.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ecuador.

Mr. Carrión-Mena (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this open debate, which will enable us to improve the implementation of the practices and new and existing measures contained in the note by the President in document S/2006/507 on the Council's working methods, taking into consideration the results of the last debate held in August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), as well as the most recent practices of the Council.

In the same way, thank you, Sir, for the concept paper circulated as an annex to your letter of 1 April (S/2010/165), in which you propose to focus this meeting on three basic issues: the transparency of the Security Council, interaction with non-members of the Council and the efficiency of the Council. You also

provide several examples of the possible issues you believe might be discussed at this meeting.

In that respect, my country, Ecuador, associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, reiterating the Movement's position at the fifty-first session of the General Assembly, as well as the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the Fifteenth Summit Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries Sharm el-Sheikh, of 2009, without prejudice to which I would like to make the following comments in my capacity as representative of Ecuador.

In the debate that took place on 27 August 2008 (see S/PV.5968), my country stressed that, despite some progress made in Security Council practices, the application of the measures in note S/2006/507 had been insufficient and uncertain. Unfortunately, almost two years later, we have seen that much still remains to be done to improve the implementation of these measures, especially those relating to transparency and to interaction with the rest of the Members of the United Nations, on whose behalf the Council should act, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations.

On the question of transparency, we note that Council Presidents have continued to hold informal briefings on the programme of work, after its adoption, and we note the informational meetings held by the chairs of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council on their respective activities.

However, with regard to the reports submitted by outgoing Presidents of the Council, there is no real systematic method in place or follow-up on the problems identified during their terms of office, which impedes the discussion and implementation of practical solutions.

Similarly, while we recognize the benefit for our region of the presentation of monthly reports by the Permanent Missions of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean that are members of the Security Council, it must be stated, in all honesty, that in many cases those reports have simply confirmed the lack of transparency between the permanent members of the Security Council and other Council members, thus contradicting the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the duty of the Council to respect them in carrying out its functions.

With regard to interaction and dialogue with countries that are not members of the Council, Ecuador appreciates the increased number of meetings open to participation by all Members of the United Nations over recent years, but regrets that such meetings continue to be the exception, while private consultations continue to be the rule. This is something that my country finds regrettable.

In this context, while we recognize the important role that closed consultations can play in seeking solutions to specific problems that come under the authority of the Security Council, my country reaffirms that priority should be given to incorporating the opinions of the other Members of the United Nations, in respect for the provisions of Articles 31 and 32 of the Charter. The same criterion should be implemented and strengthened for regional organizations and for countries that contribute troops to peacekeeping operations.

Likewise, I must point out that many of the open meetings held by the Security Council correspond precisely to topics that fall outside its jurisdiction, but which, regrettably, it continues to seek to cast, in a forced way, as threats to international peace and security in order to interfere with the mandates of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Appropriate Security Council interaction with other Member States and the other principal organs of the Organization, within the scope of their respective areas of authority, would contribute to improving the effectiveness of the Council and would facilitate the elimination of those matters previously placed on its agenda but not covered by its mandate.

A permanent and transparent dialogue between the Council and the General Assembly, with each keeping to its proper purview, would also translate into higher quality for the annual and special reports which should be submitted in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

We hope that the ideas and proposals shared on the implementation of the measures contained in note S/2006/507 and on additional measures will be followed up on appropriately and that a timely report will be issued on their implementation, which should not be limited to the Security Council Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that, beyond the formalities of this debate, all members of the Security Council need to translate the concerns and proposals regarding the working methods of the Council into specific action that will make it possible to achieve the ultimate goal of guaranteeing the transparency, open interaction and effectiveness of the Council, without prejudice to other necessary and urgent reforms relating to its membership and representativeness.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Qatar.

Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): It is a pleasure to see you, Sir, preside over the Security Council this month, and to see that you have chosen the issue of the working methods of the Council for consideration in an open debate during your presidency. Four years ago, we enjoyed working and coordinating with your delegation on this issue during our membership of the Security Council, and we appreciated your work as Chair of the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions.

We welcome this opportunity to make some frank observations on the theme of this meeting, out of a genuine interest in improving the performance of this important body.

I should like at the outset to express our support for the statement delivered by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Developing and improving the working methods of the Security Council and related procedural issues are particularly important now as they are an integral part of the process of Security Council reform, which has both structural and functional dimensions. The previous review of the Council's working methods established the need for modernization and development, identified shortcomings that should be rectified and measures that should be taken in order to enable the Security Council to fully discharge its mandate in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to revitalize its work and to maintain its credibility.

The note by the President contained in document S/2006/507 was an achievement in itself. However, further useful suggestions have been made by various parties. At least during our membership of the Council, we did not see adequate implementation of the note's recommendations, however useful those recommendations were. Here, I would like to highlight a number of points, from which the Council may benefit when updating its rules of procedure — which it is called upon to adopt in Article 30 of the Charter. Since the Council represents all the Members of the United Nations, it should take their views into account when adopting its rules of procedure.

First, the question of the veto, although a sensitive one, remains one of the central issues of Security Council reform. I will not discuss here the radical changes that are being proposed and discussed in the framework of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform, the increase in its membership and other related matters. I will only stress that it is important that the veto not be used to thwart decisions of paramount importance for the maintenance of peace and security and the protection of human beings.

Second, we are also of the view that the Security Council should adopt resolutions invoking Chapter VII of the Charter only when necessary and in a manner that is fair, and when deploying peacekeeping missions. Even in those cases, the invocation of Chapter VII should be limited to those paragraphs of the resolution that are relevant to the self-defence of the mission and other provisions that require the use of Chapter VII.

Third, I want to stress the issue of coordination between the Security Council and other United Nations organs, in particular the General Assembly, in the discharge of their mandates. In this context, we call upon the Security Council to improve the annual reports it submits to the General Assembly, in particular with regard to the quality of their analytical aspects and their recommendations. We also have views concerning the frequency of meetings between the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which are at the heart of the coordination between the two organs. Increasing the benefits resulting from these meetings can enhance the work of both organs. Already, it appears to be possible for the State holding the presidency of the Council to transmit a monthly assessment of the Council's work to the General Assembly.

Fourth, the Security Council should not only coordinate with other United Nations organs, but

should also enhance its coordination with regional and subregional organizations and entities, in line with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter, in order to enhance the success of Council measures to address issues on its agenda and contribute to the legitimacy of its work.

Fifth, the majority of United Nations Members have repeatedly stressed that the Security Council should not go beyond its mandate under the United Nations Charter, specifically Article 24. We stress here that the Council should not infringe on the functions of other United Nations organs on issues that do not involve international peace and security. At the same time, the Security Council should take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly on matters concerning the maintenance of international peace and security, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

Sixth, while we are aware of the complexity and sensitivity of the issues of which the Security Council is seized, which frequently require confidentiality, we emphasize the need to strike a balance between that requirement and the Council's responsibility to achieve transparency in its work and to serve the general membership of the United Nations. Here, we stress also the importance of consultation with the relevant authorities and of not making decisions behind closed doors. We have found it odd that, on a number of occasions, closed formal meetings have been held to consider items that do not require confidentiality, such as the periodic meetings with the President of the International Court of Justice. In the same context, we believe it would be useful to hold more Arria Formula meetings, which have proven more effective than formal meetings in addressing certain issues.

Seven, the Council has taken praiseworthy action to improve the listing and de-listing procedures of its counter-terrorism and sanctions committees, with a view to avoiding legal problems that have arisen. But the methodology of listing individuals and entities on the sanctions lists should be amended to conform to court decisions and follow legal due process.

Eight, while we know that the Security Council is a political organ, the documents it issues feed into international law and have an impact on it. We should therefore improve the work of the Council by involving legal experts from the Secretariat in the consideration of legal matters on its agenda and the agendas of its subsidiary bodies.

Ninth, we want to stress the importance of the careful selection of members of groups of experts working with subsidiary bodies, subject to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and in consultation with all Council members.

Finally, the Security Council website has proven to be an indispensable tool for following and facilitating the Council's work, and we are delighted that is being developed to keep pace with increasing demand on the part of many actors. We also welcome the endeavours of the Secretariat to promote the institutional memory of the Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Sial (Pakistan): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for holding this open debate on the working methods of the Security Council. We appreciate the interest of Japan in the subject, as reflected in document S/2006/507 and the in concept paper for today's debate annexed to the President's letter dated 1 April 2010 (S/2010/165).

We avail ourselves of this opportunity to acknowledge the role played by the group of five small countries (S-5) on the issue of working methods. The group that modestly calls itself the small five has always provided big input on the subject.

We associate ourselves with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Egypt in his capacity as Chair of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), and endorse his letter (S/2010/189) dated 15 April 2010 addressed to the Presidents of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We hope that the NAM position reflected in the comprehensive negotiating paper (see A/51/47) and the relevant paragraphs of the Sharm el-Sheikh final document (S/2009/514, annex) will be given due consideration in our collective deliberations.

Article 24, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter stipulates that, in carrying out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council acts on behalf of the United Nations Member States. Therefore, the efficiency and transparency of the Council's work and its decision-making process are issues of great interest and importance to the United Nations membership. It is

therefore also essential for the Council to comprehend the perception of the general membership of its work and of the methods it employs to carry out its mandate.

My delegation wishes to share with the Security Council our reflections on the Council's work. We will, however, limit ourselves to three areas outlined in the President's concept paper for today's debate, namely, transparency, interaction with non-members and the efficiency of the Council.

On transparency, we acknowledge some improvement in the working methods with respect to: presidential briefings on the programme of work; post-presidency assessments by respective presidencies; more frequent open debates; and improved reporting practices of the subsidiary bodies. These measures have, however, not comprehensively addressed the exclusivity of the Council's work.

The Pakistan delegation underscores the need for greater compliance with Articles 31 and 32 of the United Nations Charter and rule 48 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

The transparency of the Council warrants a semblance of balance between its open and closed meetings. We find the equation tilted towards confidentiality, even in areas where greater transparency would certainly help. Open debates and public meetings should not be a mere formality for decisions taken in informal or closed consultations, but should be a prominent factor in the Council's decision-making process.

The Security Council's progress in its interaction with non-member States will remain dependent on the level of transparency it wishes to attain. More structured interaction with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, as well as with troop- and police-contributing countries, will broaden the existing channels of communication. The consultation mechanisms should involve timely, two-way exchanges of information and views, which should be duly reflected in the Council's decision-making.

In our view, enhanced interaction with regional organizations can also be an effective channel of communication with the wider United Nations membership. In this context, the Council's increased interaction with the African Union is a good example to emulate with other regional organizations.

We agree with the assessment in the concept paper that the efficiency of the Council is constrained by the volume and diversity of its workload. However, we do not share the view that the efficiency of the Council is compromised by lengthy statements or the time period required each year for the adjustment of five new non-permanent members to the workings of the Council.

The efficiency of the Council can be enhanced if the necessary and due attention is paid to the issues on the basis of their merit rather than narrowly focusing on the national interests of those who matter. Besides, the Council should focus on its primary role for the maintenance of international peace and security instead of taking up issues that are better dealt with by other relevant bodies.

Efficiency is also closely linked to effectiveness. In recent years, the Security Council has been relatively effective in peacebuilding ventures and in addressing internal crises. Its record has been less impressive in resolving inter-State conflicts, where the Council seems constrained either due to the use of the veto or the failure to have substantive recourse to the pacific settlement of disputes in the terms of Chapter VI of the Charter.

Today's debate has underscored the fact that transparency, interaction with non-member States and the efficiency of working methods are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. That also validates the most widely held view that improving the working methods of the Council in their entirety would make the Council more democratic, inclusive and accountable to the wider membership. Such a change could be brought about by a process of election and rotation.

In the constructive spirit of today's debate, we believe that the Security Council should continue its introspection with regard to improving its working methods. At the same time, this issue is also an integral part of the comprehensive reform process that is currently at the stage of intergovernmental negotiations. We would like to conclude by stating that the consideration of this issue must continue in both forums, with a view to seeking fresh ideas. One track should not obviate the scope and importance of the other.

The President: I now give the floor the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-Kook (Republic of Korea): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's meeting to discuss an issue of great interest to the entire membership, namely, enhancing the working methods of the Security Council. We appreciate this follow-up after the debate held last August, and believe it will be helpful to assess the progress made thus far. My delegation is also grateful to the Informal Working Group on Documentation and Other Procedural Questions, whose work is instrumental in meeting the expectations of the membership with regard to the functioning of the Council.

The President's note of 2006 (see S/2006/507) was an important starting point that laid out concrete measures that, if implemented, would largely address the concerns and grievances widely voiced by the membership, while simultaneously raising overall satisfaction with the way in which the Council conducts its business. In that regard, we believe that efforts have been made to enhance the overall transparency, accountability and inclusiveness of the Council, in spite of its ever-increasing workload.

We are particularly pleased to note that the number of open meetings has increased steadily vis-à-vis closed meetings and consultations. However, the substantive nature of these open meetings could be further improved, as they are frequently adjourned after the introductory adoption of the agenda, and the core discussions proceed largely in closed consultations.

We also believe that the participation of non-members that are parties to any dispute under consideration in the Council's discussions should be ensured to the maximum, as we have found from our own experience that such interactions are immensely helpful.

Members of the Council are also making a commendable effort to share the work of the Council, for example by routinely providing briefings to their respective regional groups. Those are all steps in the right direction that go a long way towards addressing the frustrations felt by the wider membership.

We also appreciate the dedication of the Secretariat in providing relevant documents, including the reports of the Secretary-General, in a timely manner, as they are primary sources of information for Member States that do not sit on the Council. However, transparency and inclusiveness could be even better served by more substantive and analytical reports from the Security Council. The publications and submissions of the Council could be qualitatively improved to allow the wider membership more insight into its work. The Council may start out by refining its annual reports to the General Assembly to add analytical value, rather than stopping at simply giving descriptions of the work of the Council in a given year.

In addition to the measures contained in the President's note, we recognize that the Council has utilized innovative ad hoc meeting formats on a case-by-case basis in order to allow greater interaction with concerned parties and to garner meaningful input from them. It would be useful to structure and institutionalize practices that have proved productive, so that the Council's efficiency and effectiveness, as well as access by interested non-members, can be strengthened.

As a troop-contributing country (TCC) and one of the major financial contributors to peacekeeping operations, the Republic of Korea finds TCC meetings to be very useful and informative. We appreciate having more meaningful and substantive participation in the early decision-making process for peacekeeping missions.

Lastly, we would like to stress that improving the working methods of the Security Council is an important component of Council reform. That linkage sometimes results in the tendency to put the issue of working methods on the back burner while we wait for a comprehensive reform to materialize. The working methods of the Council should certainly be pursued in tandem with overall reform, but it is by its own merit too important to delay or neglect. In addition, we believe that implementing feasible measures to enhance working methods can add impetus and much-needed energy to the broader reform.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6301

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6301 st meeting

Tuesday, 27 April 2010, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Takasu	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Vukašinović
	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	China	Mr. Long Zhou
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Gabon	Mr. Issoze-Ngondet
	Lebanon	Mr. Salam
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Apakan
	Uganda	Mr. Rugunda
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Ms. Anderson

Agenda

The situation in Somalia

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1846 (2008) (S/2009/590)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-33079 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Somalia

Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1846 (2008) (S/2009/590)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Somalia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Duale (Somalia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2010/206, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, France, Gabon, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1918 (2010).

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements after the voting.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to express our gratitude to the members of the Council for their support of resolution 1918 (2010), which was submitted by the Russian Federation. We are grateful to our colleagues for the constructive approach and valuable ideas that made it possible to give momentum to this important anti-piracy initiative.

In our view, the resolution adopted today is of particular importance amid the growing threat posed by piracy off the coast of Somalia and in more distant regions of the Indian Ocean. Today, the Security Council has sent an important political message: that the international community is determined to combat impunity and intends to continue seeking additional mechanisms to enhance the effectiveness of the prosecution of those who carry out, plan and conduct acts of piracy.

Mr. Rugunda (Uganda): Uganda voted in favour of resolution 1918 (2010), on piracy in Somalia and welcomes its adoption by the Council. Piracy is an international problem that poses challenges to all countries. Therefore, combating piracy requires collective efforts and the contribution of all countries.

Uganda would like to emphasize that a more effective and comprehensive approach to combating piracy off the coast of Somalia would be to address its root causes, especially the instability in mainland Somalia. That will require greater support for the Transitional Federal Government and building the capacity of its institutions so that the Somali people can take full responsibility for their own country and their own destiny.

The President: The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 10.10 a.m.